

House of Commons Debates

FOURTH SESSION, FIFTH PARLIAMENT.—49 VIC.

SPEECH OF HON. E. BLAKE, M.P.,

ON

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND.

OTTAWA, MAY 4TH, 1886.

Mr. BLAKE. I rise for a moment to intercept that question, in order to bring before the House another, in which the last House showed a deep concern—I mean the Irish question. In 1880, I spoke my views upon this subject, and expressed my belief and hope that we should at no distant day see a measure of Home Rule granted to Ireland. In the year 1882, the question was moved on the other side of this House. At that time we, on this side, heartily co-operated in order to give the greatest possible weight to the proposed action. Then I spoke at length my opinions upon the whole question, which saves me from the necessity of trespassing now upon the time of this House, and since that time, in the best of my humble power, here and elsewhere, I have continued in the advancement of that cause. Since then, a new Canadian House of Commons has been elected, which House has not yet spoken upon the question. Since then great events have transpired in the United Kingdom itself. The people, both of Ireland and Great Britain, have received for the first time a very full measure of representation in Parliament. The Irish people, under that measure of representation, have, by an enormous, an overwhelming majority, pronounced in favor of Home Rule, and the great statesman who leads Her Majesty's Government has recognised the vital necessity of grappling at once with the question; and Her Majesty's Government have, as I ventured to suggest on a former occasion, seen the propriety of themselves formulating a plan for the settlement of that question. Now, Sir, a controversy has arisen on some of the more important details of that measure. I do not, myself, admire all those details. For example, admitting the great difficulties, I should yet prefer, to the present plan for the exclusion of Ireland from the management of Imperial affairs in which she is interested, her continued representation for those Imperial purposes in an Imperial Parliament—I should prefer the plan, notwithstanding its great difficulty, of her retaining that share of control. But it needs not to discuss this or any other matters of detail, because it has been expressly and authoritatively stated that none of these points are considered in any way vital to the question which is now before England and before the world. The vital principle now at stake is that of self-government for Ireland in local affairs. This was stated by Mr. Gladstone in his reply to the criticisms on the first reading of the Bill, and he has further and authoritatively declared it by his recent manifesto, which was transmitted to us only yesterday. In that manifesto, he thus speaks:

"As for the means we take, the establishment in Dublin of a legislative body, empowered to make laws for Irish, as contra-distinguished from Imperial, affairs. It is with us that we are now busied, and not with details and particulars; their time will come."

He adds:

"We are not debating the amount of Irish contributions to the Empire, of the composition of the legislative body, or the maintenance of representative connection with Westminster. On these questions and many more we may and we may not be at odds, but what we are at this moment debating is the large and far larger question which includes, and I think absorbs, them all—the question whether you will or will not have regard to the power of Ireland for the management by herself of her own affairs. It is this question which I feel it on my duty to speak of, and to which I feel it my duty to devote the strongest voice that the others, difficult as some of them are, nevertheless, with the aid of full discussion and with the aid of a conciliatory spirit, he found capable of a rational and tolerable settlement."

Now, Sir, that Bill to which this manifesto refers, stands for a second reading in a few days, and then that vital question is to be decided. A great excitement has arisen; the Empire has been aroused, not merely the Kingdom, but the Empire. The emotion has passed beyond the seas; it has passed beyond the Empire; the English speaking people outside the bounds of the Empire have been aroused, nay more, the free nations all over the world have been moved. Every eye is at this moment bent on Westminster, and every ear is strained to catch the echoes when they come of the great debate, and to learn the issue of the mighty struggle from beyond. Under these circumstances, marks of sympathy and of admiration have been called to the First Minister, and he has responded to them in such a sort as proves conclusively that he regards them, as they must be, helpful to him in the enormous task he has undertaken. We know as well as if we had received it already, what the tone of the reply will be to any such communication as we have on a former occasion addressed, or as other large bodies have addressed, upon this subject. The circumstances are, of course, changed; they are changed since the day we addressed Her Majesty; they are changed as to the position of the question; but they are changed in this particular also, to which I call your special attention. At that time we assumed—and I suppose we are not now prepared to resile; I am not, at any rate, prepared to resile from the assumption of our right respectfully to approach the Throne with a view to tender our humble advice and hopes upon a subject of such vital importance to the whole Empire, and to Canada as a part of the Empire. But, Sir, at this time, not merely in other particulars are the circum-

LN F5012
1886
B336 S6

1267185

stances changed, but they are changed in this: That whereas when we were asked to accede to the view that we should assume the responsibility of respectfully tendering that advice and opinion to Her Majesty's Government, that Government had not acted; now we can say that Her Majesty's Government, whether upon that advice or not, have acted in accordance with the spirit of that advice, and that we are no longer called upon by any sense of duty, and it is unnecessary that we should tender them any advice; what we are called upon now to do, under the present circumstance, is to assist them, so far as we can, by giving them our moral support in furtherance of the views which they have expressed, and in the adoption of the principle of the scheme now before Parliament. The answers which have been given to the communications which have been received show their helpfulness. To the Speaker of the Quebec Assembly, in response to their resolution, Mr. Gladstone writes:

"I am deeply grateful at the resolution adopted by your honorable body. It is my belief that the people of the Colonies have a full responsibility for the old misdeeds of the British Government, and the people of Ireland who have really none, will concur in the wise and liberal view entertained by the Quebec Assembly."

To the Mayor of Boston, in answer to the resolution of the city, he cabled:

"I feel that American opinion, allied as it is with a regard and affection for the Old Country, affords Her Majesty's Government a powerful moral support."

Then, shall we be slack to-day? Shall we be silent now who spoke before? I say, no. We are bound to speak and to speak now. Else it will be said of us: "You spoke ere the question was ripe, when your words embarrassed; now that it is near, even at the doors, you withhold your help."

See it will be inferred that we have changed our minds, and that no longer does the House of Commons approve of local self-government for Ireland. Our silence to-day will be a positive insult as our speech to-day would be helpful. It was but yesterday that we were asked to appeal to the people of the Empire to support the measure. He said, indeed, direct to the words which I am about to say to the members of the population of Great Britain; and this is what he says:

"Watching from day to day the movement of the currents of opinion during the present conflict, more and more I find it vital to observe the point at which the dividing lines are drawn on the side adverse to the Government. They are found, as I sorrowfully admit, in profuse abundance, in station, title, wealth, social influence and the professions, and a large majority of them in the world, spirit and power of class. These are the main body of the opposing host. Nor is this all. As knights of old had squires, so in the great army of class each enrolled soldier has a roll of dependents. The adverse host, then, consists of class and dependents of class; but this formidable army is the bulk of its constituents, part of the same, though now enriched at our cost, with a valuable contingent of recruits that has fought in every Government the greatest political battles of the last sixty years, and has been defeated. We have a great aim. For us now it is to restore your parliamentary efficiency, by dividing and by removing obstacles to its work, to treat the Irish question with due regard to its specialities, but with the same thoroughness of method by which we have solved colonial problems, that fifty years back were hardly, if at all, less formidable. To give heed to the voice of the people speaking in tones of moderation, by the mouth of the vast majority of those whom we ourselves have made its constitutional representatives, and thus to strengthen and consolidate the Empire on the basis of mutual benefit and hearty loyalty."

I ask whether we, too, though that appeal is not a direct appeal to us, we too, a democratic people, kinsmen of those he addresses, of that very mass of the population to which Mr. Gladstone speaks, shall not echo and further his appeal. He describes in the same manifesto the response from the world. This he speaks:

"Never have I known an occasion when a parliamentary event so rang through the world as the introduction of this Bill, under the auspices of the British Government. From public meetings and from the highest authorities in the Colonies, from capitals such as Washington, Cincinnati, Boston, Quebec, and from the remotest districts lying beyond the reach of all ordinary political excitement, I receive the conclusive assurance that kindred people regard it with warm and fraternal sympathy. Our present effort is to settle, on an adequate scale, and once for all, the long vexed and troubled relations between England and Ireland, which exhibit to us the one and only conspicuous failure of the political genius of our race, to confront and master a difficulty, and to obtain in a reasonable degree the main ends of civilised life."

I ask, under those circumstances, and when the highest testimony is given to those resolutions from various quarters, and their utility, shall Canada, who was earliest in the field, be dumb to-day? Shall her voice, so loud before, be silent now? Shall we not listen to that mute appeal and cause our names to be enrolled amongst those who constitute the forces of the great public opinion throughout the world, giving an added impulse to the progress of this great measure? I dare not be silent longer. I do not bring this as a party question. I have waited till the last moment, hoping that some one on the other side of the House would move. That hope I have been obliged to abandon. I see that the Minister of Inland Revenue has declined to move, and has cabled for himself and for the Irish representatives in Parliament the assurance of his and their adhesion to the address of 1882. I do not undervalue his assurance. But it is not the assurance required. What is required is the assurance, not of one, but of all classes; not of a section, but of the people; not of a Minister of the Crown, but of the Commons of Canada; not of the Irish Catholic members, but of the French and English, Scotch, Irish and German, of all creeds and of all nationalities. To substitute the hon. gentleman's assurance for our voice would be to acknowledge that we do not choose now to speak in the sense in which we spoke then, and in which he declares his own readiness to speak again. I therefore speak, but not as a Reformer, or as a party leader; I speak as a Canadian and citizen of the Empire to brother Canadians and fellow-citizens of the Empire. I am not a Protestant or a Catholic question; they are questions of their country who would make it so. It should not be so in Canada at all events, a Conservative or a Reform measure. I regard those as the enemies of their country who would try to make it so. I hope that we may, by our own action this day, show ourselves united in the redress of wrongs and in the advancement of the cause of liberty. For my part I should feel myself nothing less than a coward and a criminal should we, without any effort of mine, stand passive to-day and fail to lend our help at this critical moment to the cause of freedom and local self-government for the Irish people. I, therefore, move to leave out all the words after "that" and insert the following:—

An humble address he presented to Her Majesty to respectfully assure Her Majesty that the interest and concern felt by the Commons of Canada, and the people whom they represent, in the condition of Ireland, and their desire that some means may be found of meeting the expressed wishes of so many of Her Majesty's Irish subjects for the grant to Ireland of a measure of local self-government still continue as warm and earnest as in the year 1882, when they were humbly signified to Her Majesty by an address to the terms to which this House affirms its abiding adhesion.

Humbly to inform Her Majesty that this House hails with joy the submission by Her Majesty's Government to the Parliament of the United Kingdom of a measure recognising the principle of local self-government for Ireland."

And humbly to express to Her Majesty the earnest hope of this House that the principle of the said measure may be affirmed, so that it may form the basis for such a settlement of this great question as shall conduce to the peace, happiness and prosperity of the Empire.

House of Commons Debates

FOURTH SESSION, FIFTH PARLIAMENT.—49 VIC.

Vol. XVIII.

Ottawa, Thursday, May 6, 1886.

No. 46.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the honned edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the honned edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 6th May, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

GOVERNMENT SAVINGS BANK—INDEPENDENT ORDER OF FORESTERS.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, Has the Independent Order of Foresters been allowed to deposit \$10,000 in the Government Savings Bank Department?

Mr. McLELAN. Under the law, we are not permitted to disclose the names of depositors. There are a number of large amounts in the Savings Banks. I think up to 1876 or 1877, there was no limit to the amount received; then it was limited by Order in Council to \$10,000, and subsequently, in 1880, it was reduced to \$3,000. I think the practice in England and this country for some time was to receive deposits of charitable societies for larger sums than the limit, on the ground that they are supposed to be the collection of savings of a number of individuals gathered together.

QUAI DE LA "STANSTEAD, SHEFFORD AND CHAMBLAY RAILWAY COMPANY."

M. BÉCHARD: Est-ce l'intention du gouvernement de faire démolir le quai, que la "Stanstead, Shefford and Chamblay Railway Company" a fait construire, sans autorisation, au milieu de la rivière Richelieu, sur une étendue couvrant environ les deux tiers de cette rivière, le long du pont de la dite compagnie, dans le voisinage des villes de Saint-Jean et d'Iberville?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON: En l'absence du ministre des chemins de fer, j'ai l'honneur de répondre à l'honorable député que l'attention du gouvernement n'a pas été attirée sur cette question avant aujourd'hui.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to say a word with reference to a statement made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) in the discussion of the motion of the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). That hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) is reported in *Hansard* to have said:

* I find, Sir, that the Ontario and Pacific Railway, running through Oorwall to Perth, has been bounsed to the extent of \$262,400, and that

the hon. member for Oorwall (Mr. Bergin) and the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) are stockholders in that company."

Then the hon. gentleman said again:

"I find, Sir, that in 1885 this Parliament granted to the Ottawa, Waddington and Northern Transportation Railway \$166,000, and that the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White), the hon. members for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé and Mr. Mackintosh) are stockholders in the company."

I simply wish to say, in reference to those statements, that I am not now and never have been a stockholder in either of those companies. I regret I was temporarily absent when these statements were made, and was consequently unable to deny them then, but I take this, the first opportunity which presents itself, to make the denial.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to call attention to a matter in connection with the debate of the 4th inst. In giving a list of applicants for coal land leases, I mentioned the name of the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) as one of the applicants, and the following words were exchanged between us, as reported in the *Hansard*—

"Mr. HAGGART. An application that I made? For what?

"Mr. CHARLTON. A coal lease.

"Mr. HAGGART. No, I did not.

"Mr. CHARLTON. I found your name in the returns.

"Mr. HAGGART. No, you did not.

"Mr. CHARLTON. Well, we will hunt it up."

I have hunted it up, and this is the document:

"OTTAWA, December 9th, 1883.

"Sir,—I have the honor to apply for a mining location, being west half of Section 16, Township 3, Range 9, west of second meridian, and I will comply with all the requirements of the Statute and the regulations of the Department.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"JOHN HAGGART.

"The Hon. the Minister of Interior,
"Ottawa."

"OTTAWA, December 15th, 1882.

"Sir,—I have the honor, by direction of the Minister of Interior, to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 9th inst., applying for a coal mine location, being the west half of Section 16, Township 3, Range 9, west of the second principal meridian, North-West Territory.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"A. RUSSELL,

"For the Minister of Interior.

"JOHN HAGGART, Esq., M.P.,
"Perth, Ontario."

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND.

Mr. BLAKE. In pursuance of the Orders of the Day, and for the reasons I stated on Tuesday, no intimation having reached me from any member of the House that a portion of this motion is, in its form or substance, objectionable, I beg to move in the form of which I gave notice:

That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty to respectfully assure Her Majesty that the interest and concern felt by the Commons of Canada and the people whom they represent in the condition of Ireland, and their desire that some means may be found of meeting the expressed wishes of so many of Her Majesty's Irish subjects for the grant to Ireland of a measure of local self-government, still continue as warm and earnest as in the year 1882, when they were humbly signified to Her Majesty by an Address to which this House affirms its abiding adhesion;

humbly to inform Her Majesty that this House halla with joy the submission by Her Majesty's Government to the Parliament of the United Kingdom of a measure recognising the principle of local self-government for Ireland;

And humbly to express to Her Majesty the earnest hope of this House that the principle of the said measure may be affirmed, and that it may form the basis for such a settlement of this great question as shall conduce to the peace, happiness and prosperity of the Empire.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Without referring to what has already taken place when this motion was brought before this House on a former occasion, I feel bound to offer a few remarks with regard to the position that I then took, and the position that I intend to take to day on that subject. It is, no doubt, felt by many of our friends in different parts of the country that the Parliament of Canada ought to be again asked to express an opinion on the subject of Home Rule, or to express its sympathy with the people of Ireland in their efforts to obtain that system of government which we prize so highly in this country. It is no secret, nor did I intend that it should be, because full publicity was given to the facts, that representative men of one very prominent Irish society of this city called upon me, urging the propriety of moving some resolution on this question. Their object, of course, was not to consult with me as to the desirability, or otherwise, of taking that step, because those who have read the reports of the proceedings of the society will see that, in the first place, the society decided that that was the proper step to take, that some resolution should be moved, and they then decided that a committee should ask me to take that step. The reasons that I gave them, I think, hold good at present, I stated, and I repeat now, that, if on that occasion we had not been successful, and whether hopeful of success now or not, if we had failed on that occasion, we might and it would be our duty to make another attempt to gain an expression of sympathy from so important a body as this is. Then, having succeeded beyond, as I stated before, the most sanguine expectations of the most earnest Irishmen in this country, in obtaining a unanimous expression of sympathy from this Parliament in favor of the Irish people and the constitutional agitation they were carrying on for the attainment of that system of government and those constitutional privileges which we enjoy in this country and cherish so highly, I believed, for one, that it was not only not prudent or advisable, but that we had no just reason for asking Parliament to take this question up again. I noticed that in some of the city papers giving my reasons for refusing to move in that direction when I was called upon to do so, it was declared that I stated that my reason was that I feared the defeat of the resolution. I deny ever having made such a statement. I entertain no such fear. I am quite satisfied that the Parliament of Canada, that the representative men in this country are always ready and willing to give an expression consistent with the privileges and the constitution under which we live, and that there is no man in Canada who would not be willing to see his fellow-men in any part of the globe enjoying the privileges of free and self-government which we enjoy in Canada. I did say, however, that, as we could not expect to get Parliament to give a stronger expression of opinion, what would be the object of introducing the question again, when the risk might be to get a weaker expression of opinion. I did not say that the question would be defeated. I did not entertain such a belief at all, but it is possible that some division might take place, that some one man or some two members, or three or four, if you will, might differ from the views taken by the majority of the House of Commons on that occasion, and therefore, to that extent, the expression would be that much weakened. I am not on this occasion going to make any allusions, or to impute motives either to the hon. gentleman who has moved this resolution or to those gentlemen who, outside, have suggested that it should be moved. I am simply

Mr. COSTIGAN.

going to take the ground that I intend to discharge my duty faithfully and honestly in the interests of the country, and with a due regard to the expectations that my particular countrymen entertain of the manner in which I should discharge my duty here. I know that my motives have already been attacked; I must submit to that. I will not retaliate at present. I will confine myself particularly to the duty that I think deserves upon me now. That duty is, while I take the same ground that I took before, while I say I would not be responsible for bringing this question again before Parliament for the reasons I gave, that Parliament can give no stronger expression than it generously gave before, to see, as far as I can, now that it is forced upon Parliament, as a believer in the free institutions of this country, and one anxious and willing that those free institutions should be extended to our fellow-countrymen in Ireland, that no adverse vote shall be recorded on this question, no matter who is responsible for it. With that view, I propose to move an amendment to the motion placed in your hand by the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat. Before I do that, I must also give another ground which I stated at a very early stage when discussing this question with some friends outside. I stated that, in view of the reception with which the respectful Message sent by the Parliament of this country to Her Majesty met at the hands of the Government then, by the reply given by the Earl of Kimberley, I did not think it would be right to ask this Parliament to move another Address in view of the reply given at that time. Nor do I believe that, so far as that particular phase of the question is concerned, if it be brought in as an evidence of sympathy with our people, that our people care little in what form that Address shall come. All they want is an assurance that the Parliament of this country sympathise with their fellow-countrymen in Ireland in their efforts to obtain the rights which, as I said before, we prize so highly in this country. I, therefore, beg leave to move in amendment to the motion, seconded by Sir Hector Langevin:

That all the words after "That" be struck out, and the following added instead thereof:—"The Government of Canada desire to express their deep and abiding interest in the prosperity and happiness of their fellow-subjects in Ireland, and their adhesion to the sentiments expressed in the Joint Address to Her Majesty of both Houses of the Canadian Parliament passed in the Session of 1881;

That in such Address Parliament suggested that Canada and its inhabitants had prospered exceedingly under a Federal system, allowing to each Province of the Dominion considerable powers of self-government, and expressed a hope 'that if consistent with the integrity and well-being of the Empire, and if the rights and status of the minority were fully protected and secured, some means might be found of meeting the expressed desires of so many of Her Majesty's Irish subjects in that regard.'

That in answer to the said Address the then Secretary of State for the Colonies was commanded to state that 'Her Majesty will always gladly receive the advice of the Parliament of Canada on all matters relating to the Dominion and the administration of its affairs, but with respect to the questions referred to in the Address Her Majesty will, in accordance with the constitution of this country, have regard to the advice of the Imperial Parliament and Ministers, to whom all matters relating to the affairs of the United Kingdom exclusively appertain.'

That this House, having reference to the tenor of the said answer, does not deem it expedient again to address Her Majesty on the subject, but earnestly hopes that such a measure or such measures may be adopted by the Imperial Parliament as will, while preserving the integrity and well-being of the Empire and the rights and status of the minority, be satisfactory to the people of Ireland, and permanently remove the discontent so long unhappily prevailing in that country.'

Before resuming my seat, I would ask the privilege of adding a few words. I think, if the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution now before the House, to which this is an amendment, will consider this matter, he will acknowledge that the amendment will cover the grounds as well as his resolution, with the exception that it does not propose an Address to Her Majesty. I do not think that it will be asking the hon. gentleman to make too great a sacrifice if I say that I think he would do well to give his support even to the amendment, in order that it may have that strength which a united action alone can give it in its passage through this House. The hon. gentleman may

object, on the ground that he still prefers the terms of his own resolution; but he must remember also, that, on a former occasion, when I moved the resolutions of 1882, he then found fault with their terms, as did many of his friends, and stated that they had been mutilated—in fact, emasculated, so that they were almost worthless. The hon. gentleman, the other day, in alluding to those resolutions, stated that on that occasion Parliament spoke, and spoke loudly. I think it did; I think it spoke loud enough, and I think that all reasonable-minded men will be satisfied if Parliament speaks in the same terms to-day. The fact of the resolutions being mutilated or emasculated did not prove that they were not the wisest that could have been carried by that House. The object was to carry such resolutions as would embody the principles that we advocated at that time, and those resolutions did clearly embody those principles. They secured the most important end—they secured the unanimous support of that House, and the almost unanimous support of the Senate. More than that: after the action of Parliament had become known to the representative Irishmen on the other side of the water, those who, I suppose, were as deeply interested in this question as any man in this country can be, the Irish representatives in the Imperial Parliament at that time, met and returned a vote of thanks—not to the political leader of the Conservative party, not to the political leader of the Liberal party, not to the mover or seconder of the resolutions, but they returned their sincere thanks to the Parliament of Canada for passing an Address which they considered the most important step that had been taken outside of the Empire. With these remarks I will take my seat, earnestly hoping that this amendment, being a repudiation of the sentiments expressed, and which were so acceptable to the people of this country in 1882, may be acceptable to the House now, and that it may pass now with the same unanimity that the resolutions did on that occasion.

Mr. CASEY. I have heard the remarks which have fallen from the Minister of Inland Revenue with regret that he should have seen fit to adopt the course he has taken. He adheres to his former argument, the argument which he said he used in speaking to the deputation which asked him to take charge of a measure of this kind: first, that the former expression of opinion was sufficient; and, next, that it was not prudent to bring it up now because he feared, not the defeat of the motion, but a less unanimous expression of opinion than that formerly given. He said: "Why should we bring it up now, why renew it? Was not the expression of opinion which this House gave in 1882 quite sufficient?" If the hon. gentleman asks me for reasons why we should renew that expression of opinion, I have plenty to give him. First, because this is a new Parliament. After that expression of opinion in 1882 the members of this House went to their constituents, and if the constituents objected to the course taken in 1882 they had means of showing it. I do not think there is anything in the result of that election to show that they did object to that expression of opinion. But we do wish to put on record the fact that this House of Commons, after the expression of opinion given by the former House of Commons and after consulting the constituents, entertains the same opinion that the House held four years ago. That is one reason for renewing the expression of opinion. Another reason is, and it is a still stronger one, because now Home Rule is a practical issue. When we spoke before we were only urging the Government of Great Britain to take a step which it seemed almost hopeless to hope they would take so soon as they have taken it, for although my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition did express the almost certainty that the accession to power of the Liberal Government in Great Britain would bring about this result, it seemed more hopeless to the rest of us. We

are glad to find that he has proved a truer prophet than our own fears. The accession of that Government to power has had the result which the hon. gentleman anticipated. At that time, I say, the resolution passed by this House was merely an expression of the vague opinion that something of the kind should be done and a vague hope that it might be done. Now it is a practical issue; now something has been proposed; now a measure, however defective some of us may think it, has been submitted to the British House of Commons, and apparently it has a possibility, at least, of being adopted in principle, a measure adopting, at all events, the great theory of Home Rule, however we may differ from the details proposed in that measure. Now I say is the time when our re-expression of opinion will be useful. The old resolution might possibly have been regarded as having been got up for a political object.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. I say it might have been regarded at that time, when Home Rule was not a practical issue, as having been got up for a political object; but now, when Home Rule has ripened, when Home Rule is in process of being granted to Ireland, an expression of opinion coming from this House, of which the great majority is known to be Conservative, would not be looked upon as a political dodge, but would be looked upon as a sincere and earnest attempt to strengthen the hands of those who are working for justice to Ireland. And it would have that effect if it had come, in the first place, from the Minister of Inland Revenue, just as much as it will now, when the proposal has come from the leader on this side of the House. I deeply regret that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) has seen fit to throw objections in the way of approving a motion of this kind, and has repeated on the floor of this House his objections given to a deputation, and thereby weakened most appreciably the effect that will be produced by the resolution when it is adopted. After having heard that we should not have discussed the question at all, after having refused to introduce a proposal of this kind in the House, after the proposal has been introduced by another hon. member, the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue goes on to propose an amendment to the resolution. That is not the course we would expect him to adopt, from the language he used when the question was up on Tuesday. When the leader of the Opposition proposed this resolution, the Minister of Inland Revenue asked for time to consider the resolution and time to consult with the leader of the Opposition upon a form of words which would be acceptable to the whole House, if the form then proposed was not acceptable. The hon. gentleman asked for time, and he asked for liberty to make suggestions. The time was granted by the mover of the resolution; the liberty to make suggestions was also granted. Nay, he was invited to do so, and certainly understood from the tenor of the Minister's remarks, that he was only waiting for an opportunity to make suggestions. Has he made suggestions? I do not know. Has he asked the leader of the Opposition to consult with him as to the wording of the resolution? I do not know; but it does not look like it. If he had consulted the leader of the Opposition, he would probably have stated so; if there had been differences as to the forms of words he would, no doubt, have stated so. But instead of taking advantage of the opportunity for which he asked, he has come down with an amendment proposing to proceed in a different manner from that proposed by the leader of the Opposition. I think this conduct is inconsistent with the expressions he used on Tuesday; inconsistent with his duty as one who has taken a prominent part in promoting the principle of Home Rule, and whose duty it is to see that everything should be done in such a manner as to secure the largest possible support to any legislation that could be introduced to secure that

principle. He tells us that is his object in introducing this amendment. But, Sir, if he had that object in view intelligently, he must have seen that the way to secure unanimity, was not to bring in an amendment of which no notice has been given to this side of the House at this period of the discussion, but to consult with the leader of the Opposition, who had introduced the original motion, and try to agree with him on such a form of words as the House would unanimously accept. Of course, I am in no position to say whether the mover of the resolution will accept the amendment or not, but, without regard to anything he may do, I desire to express my own disapprobation of it, and my preference for the original motion. The sole reason which the hon. gentleman alleged for this change is contained in the Kimberley message, which he has incorporated in his amendment. Now, Sir, what is the effect of that resolution incorporating that message? I have not had time, of course, to carefully weigh and ponder every word in it, but it seems to me to amount to a statement to the British Government. We asserted in 1882 our right to petition the Throne, in regard to a matter which we declared to be of Imperial significance, but which we declared to have material bearings on the prosperity of Canada as well. You snubbed us, and now we accept the snub. We accept the statement that we have no right to petition the Throne; we accept the position of outsiders, in which that message appears to put us. I say that the acceptance of that resolution by this House, appears to me to be an acceptance of the snub which was administered to this House by the then Secretary for the Colonies, at the time we sent the former resolution. If the hon. Minister does not mean it for that, it must have another signification. It must be an expression of sulkiness on the part of this House. If he does not mean to say: We accept the snub, he can only mean: You would not hear us before, when we offered advice on this subject; now your Premier has actually invited an expression of opinion from similar bodies, has rejoiced in receiving them not only from the Colonies but outside of the Empire, and now, when you are willing to hear our advice, and when our advice is invited by the Premier and the English Government, we will get on our high horse and sulkily refuse an address to you. Instead of placing our opinions in the form of an address, directed to the quarter where they will have most effect, we will raise our eyes to Heaven and express a vague namby-pamby hope that the Government of England will be led by the help of Providence, without assistance on our part, to do that which will be best for Ireland and the Empire. Now, I object to take either position. I object to admitting that we have not the right to petition. Granting the right of petition, I object to taking the ground that, because they would not hear us before, we will not speak to them now, when they are willing to hear us. And I must refer—although it has been already referred to—the remarks of Mr. Gladstone in his late manifesto. They have been presented to the House, but they do not seem to have made any impression on the mind of the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment. I hope they may now sink into his mind. Mr. Gladstone writes to the Legislative Assembly of Quebec:

"I am deeply grateful at the resolution adopted by your honorable body. It is my belief that the people of England, who have partial responsibility for the old misdeeds of the British Government, and the people of Ireland who have really none, will co-operate in the wise and liberal view entertained by the Quebec Assembly." There is a distinct expression of thanks for an expression of opinion, not from the Dominion Parliament but from the Parliament of one of the Provinces, whose right to address the Crown on such a matter must be even *prima facie* less than ours, if there is any difference in rights at all. To the Mayor of Boston, in answer to a resolution, he said:

"I feel that American opinion, allied as it is with a regard and affection for the Old Country, affords Her Majesty's Government a powerful moral support."

MR. CASEY,

That is not addressed to a British Legislative Assembly of any kind, not to a body representing 5,000,000 of British subjects. It is addressed to the mayor of an American city, and he says that even American public opinion must afford the Government powerful moral support. What, then, would be the support afforded to that Government by an expression of opinion by this Parliament, known to be composed of representatives of all races and all creeds, a Parliament known to contain a very large Conservative majority, so far as Canadian politics are concerned? Would not such an expression of opinion serve to show that men, not only of all races and creeds, but men of both political parties, recognised the fairness of the principle of Home Rule as applied to Ireland, and afford the most powerful moral support possible to the man who is risking so much to carry out that principle? Then, again, in his address delivered a few days ago, known generally as the Gladstone manifesto—his address to his own constituents—he said:

"Never have I known an occasion when a parliamentary event so rang through the world as the introduction of this Bill, under the auspices of the British Government. From public meetings and from the highest authorities in the colonies, from capitals such as Washington, Cincinnati, Boston, Quebec, and from the remotest districts lying beyond the reach of all ordinary political excitement, I receive the conclusive assurance that kindred people regard it with warm and fraternal sympathy. Our present effort is to settle, on an adequate scale, and once for all, the long-veiled and troubled relations between England and Ireland, which exhibit to us the one and only conspicuous failure of the political genius of our race to confront and master a difficulty, and to obtain in a reasonable degree the main ends of civilised life."

What is the meaning of those words. Is it not a recognition that not only Quebec, a French Province living under British rule, filled now with British sympathy and love for British constitutional Government, not only a French Province like Quebec, but even States entirely severed from the Empire, are members of the great British family council, composed of the offspring that have come from the loins of that great nation? Is it not a recognition of our fellow-citizenship in the British Empire? I say it is. It is more than a recognition of our right to speak in that family council. It is an invitation to lay our opinions before the head of that family, with the assurance that those opinions will be accepted with gratitude and regarded with the favor and respect that their importance deserves. Now, whatever may have been the effect of the Kimberley message, whatever may have been the meaning of it, whatever may be our constitutional and technical right to petition the Throne, these acknowledgments, coming not only from the Colonial Secretary but from the Premier of Great Britain, take away utterly any effect that might be in that message tending to discourage colonial legislative bodies from expressing opinions on this great question; and if the Minister of Inland Revenue has nothing stronger to shelter himself behind, when he asks the House to depart from the usual constitutional method of addressing the Throne, and express an anxiety and great hopes and wishes to the skies and atmosphere, I say his defence is of the most flimsy character. Let me recall to your memory the fact that my hon. friend the proposer of this motion objected to his mutilated motion on a former occasion; yet on that occasion my hon. friend accepted it because there was no opportunity of amending it, and because he did not wish to have any discussion in the House in connection with the matter. That conduct stands out in bold relief to the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite. They did not, it appears, altogether relish the form in which this motion was proposed before. Instead of accepting it for the purpose of avoiding division in the House on this great non-political question, they took a course which must necessarily lead to difference of opinion; whether it leads to difference of vote or not will depend on the self-sacrifice of the members of the House who hold contrary opinions. The hon. leader of the Government sneered at the resolution, and threw cold water on the whole proposal. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, who has

always posed as the leader of this movement, also threw cold water on it by asking for delay. He has thrown more cold water on it to-day by asking us to abdicate our constitutional right of petition, and to accept a wishy-washy proposal of vague hope and sympathy. This course stands out in bold contrast to the sacrifice of individual opinion displayed by my hon. friend on the former occasion. I hope yet that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, having screwed his courage up to the point of proposing a resolution in that form, will go still further, and have the courage to adopt the form of petition, which we adopted in 1882—what we had a right to do then, and what we have a right to do now. He says the matter of the amendment is identical with that of the motion. I cannot say whether it is or not, because I have not had the opportunity of carefully reading it. If it is, there is simply a difference of manner and not of matter, and if that is the case I think he must show stronger reasons for departing from the precedent we have already set ourselves than he has yet shown. If it were necessary, Sir, to discuss the question of Home Rule itself, to discuss whether Canadians should support some resolution sympathizing with that principle, I could do so with great pleasure, and at a length which I am afraid would not be pleasing to the House. I do not intend to do so at any length; but being on my feet, I feel that I cannot sit down without saying a few words on that subject, even though it may not be necessary for the conviction of hon. members of this House. Though of Irish descent, and though proud of that descent, I hope I shall be able to discuss this question rather as a Canadian than as an Irishman. I hold that Home Rule is as much a principle of the Canadian people, is a sentiment as dear to the Canadian heart, as it is to that of native Irishmen; I mean Home Rule in the general sense, not merely as applied to Ireland, but as applied to all isolated communities who claim the right to manage their own affairs. I should be as ready to support a proposal of Home Rule for Scotland or for Wales, if the people of those countries demanded it with the same unanimity, as I am to support the proposal of Home Rule for Ireland. We, in Canada, have been living under Home Rule for the last nineteen years; we know its effects, and we are generally agreed that those effects are good. I mean that since that time we have had Provincial Home Rule. We have had Home Rule as colonies for a still longer time, and there are some of us old enough to remember what it cost us to obtain it. But for the last nineteen years we have been living under an enlarged system of Home Rule—Federal Home Rule, under which each Province has the right to manage its own affairs. Now, having once expressed our approval of that principle, it would become as now to do other than unanimously reassert that approval. The right of these Provinces and of this Dominion to do what they like within their own constitutional bounds, is an axiom in the constitutional theory of Canada; and if we refuse to apply this axiom to the affairs of Ireland, we are not only doing a wrong with respect to Irish affairs, but committing ourselves to the position that the application of this axiom has not worked well in the affairs of Canada; and there is great similarity in some respects between the affairs of Canada and those of the United Kingdom. Ireland is peopled by a race different in origin and religion from the mass of the people of the British Empire. Canada also has its Provinces, the majority of whose people differ in race and religion from those of the rest of the Dominion. Ireland and Quebec stand in somewhat similar circumstances in this regard. Troubles arose under the old Legislative Union of Upper and Lower Canada out of those differences of race and religion, and it was largely from those troubles that the proposal for Confederation grew. Has Confederation been a cure for those troubles? Ask the people of Quebec in Legislature as

sembled. They have given an almost unanimous declaration of opinion in favor of Home Rule, thereby inferring that Home Rule has worked well with them. Another parallel exists in the fact that there is a large Protestant minority in Ireland whose rights some people fear will be injured by the concession of Home Rule to that country. There is a large Protestant minority in the Province of Quebec. Has Home Rule in Quebec been disastrous to the Protestant minority? I do not think any member of this House will contend that it has. It is evident that the English-speaking members of the Quebec Assembly do not think it has, for they have given their assent to the principle of Home Rule. And is it to be asserted that the people of Ireland, with whom so many of us are allied by race, are less reliant or less disposed to live at peace and harmony among themselves under Home Rule than the people of Quebec? I repudiate the assertion, if any one is hardy enough to make it. No doubt there have been quarrels and troubles in Ireland between the adherents of the two religions, more than in most countries; but why? Almost entirely because they have not had the opportunity of managing their domestic affairs, and because one section has been to a great extent, by the authority of the law, placed in a position of superiority over the other, and in a position to injure it. Irishmen are not known to be disloyal to the law anywhere except in their native country; no man is naturally more loyal to a Government with which he is contented than an Irishman; and if this is not the case in Ireland, what is the cause of it? Except that there Irishmen have not the right to rule themselves. If England goes halfway to meet Ireland, I believe Ireland will go more than halfway to meet England. I am afraid that is rather an Irish expression, because under those circumstances they would hardly meet, but if England goes any distance to meet Ireland, I believe Ireland will go twice as far to meet her; and the result of a fair attempt to meet Ireland will be to make Irishmen in their native land as loyal to the Government under which they live as they are in Canada or in the United States, or in any other country where they live under a Government which they have a share in managing. Besides, this principle, I contend, is in accord with the spirit of the age. We are told that the people of Ireland are not quite prepared to govern themselves. Well, a man cannot learn to swim until he gets into the water, and the people of Ireland cannot learn self-government until they have it. Let us take an instance and comparison. Are the people of Ireland any less prepared to govern themselves, are they any less prepared to swim without experience in the water of politics than were the people of Hungary, when it was a dependency of the Austrian Empire, and in a state of disaffection even greater than that in which Ireland has been for years? No one will assert that the Hungarians were better prepared to govern themselves, yet they were granted self-government by the Austrian Empire, and have managed to make it a very fair success. Take the other view of the question, that Home Rule in Ireland will lead to the disruption of the Empire. Is Austria to-day not a more united Empire, and stronger against all her foes, without and within, than she was before Home Rule was granted to Hungary? Are not Austria and Hungary to-day a greater force in the politics of Europe than was Austria, as an Empire, with her Hungarian Empire to quell and keep in subjection, year after year? Of course she is. Therefore, I say this movement is in harmony with the spirit of the age, and will tend to promote the happiness of the people and the credit of the Empire. For that reason, not only those who favor local autonomy, but all true friends of the Empire, should support the measure which seems more likely than any other to secure for the Empire itself union, strength, and solidarity throughout the world. For all these reasons, I give my hearty support, in the first place,

to the resolution introduced by my hon. friend as leader, and in the second place, if that resolution should not meet the acceptance of the House, to whatever form of words may be agreed upon by the House and to which we can give our unanimous support; while I maintain, at the same time, a strong preference for the form of proceeding we have already adopted. In this, I believe I am only doing my duty, not as an Irishman, but as a Canadian. I believe the action this House will take will greatly strengthen the hands of the venerable statesman who is risking all the fruits of a great and long career to do what he conceives to be just to Ireland, and who is doing this at the risk of losing the support of many who have been his friends through life. In that position he demands the sympathy of the world, and I hope he will receive the sympathy, not only of Reformers but of Conservatives as well, throughout British countries. It should be remembered by all those who deal with this matter in British countries, that it requires to be dealt with in such a way that their action will do nothing to weaken his hands, but a good deal to strengthen them. This has been spoken by some as a Catholic question. I protest against any such insinuation. Protestants in Canada are Home Rulers to as great an extent as Catholics. Even in the Protestant part of Ireland, Ulster, the black North, as it is sometimes called, a majority of Home Rulers was elected at the last general elections, a small majority, to be sure; but I wish to show you, Sir, that the majority obtained at the polls there did not represent the real strength of the Home Rule vote cast in Ulster. In constituencies where there was not a sufficient number of Home Rulers to justify that party in bringing out candidates of their own, they supported the Conservative candidates. At that time the Conservative party in England were holding out the right hand of fellowship to Mr. Parnell, and led him and his party to believe something great would be extended to them by the Conservatives if elected. Therefore, in counties where only Liberals and Conservatives were running, Home Rulers were requested by Mr. Parnell to vote for the Conservative candidates. I have even seen, in an Irish paper, a letter of Mr. Parnell's, directing the Home Rulers to vote for Mr. Johnston, of Ballykilbeg, the candidate of the Orangemen, and the most Orange of Orangemen; and the fact that he was returned is, to some extent, due to the existence of a Home Rule feeling in that county.

Mr. O'BRIEN. What does he think of Montreal?

Mr. CASEY. He has got a different opinion now, but no doubt he was glad to receive the support of the Home Rulers then; and if his leader had introduced a measure of Home Rule, his opinions would have been modified; but, not imitating the generosity of the Home Rulers who supported him, he has shown himself since then much more bitter and outrageous in his conduct in Ireland to the mass of the people than ever before. He has used in his speeches language which I will not, out of justice to the debates, quote, which I would not be justified with any regard to the propriety of the debate, to quote. I hope the result of this discussion will be to adopt some resolution that will materially advance the prospects of Home Rule, and affirm in a dignified manner the right of the Canadian Parliament to approach the Crown with a petition.

Mr. CURRAN. The question now before the House is one of such vast importance, involving, as it does, so much, not only that concerns the material interests of Ireland, but the deepest and unanimous feeling of a large section of the people of the Dominion, that I feel I would be wanting in my duty were I not to say a few words on this occasion, expressive of the sentiments I have always held—sentiments which have not been born within me since I entered political life, and which it might be, perhaps, to my advantage to parade, but sentiments which I have labored to

promote, and which I shall continue to treasure until this question of Home Rule for Ireland becomes what has been the dream of my boyhood and the labor of my maturer years; and I trust I may live to witness, and that before long, before my old age has come, the people of Ireland contented and happy under Home Rule, and giving strength, power and prestige to the Empire at large. My first impression, on rising to address this House, however, is, I am bound to say, that I regret exceedingly a certain portion of the remarks which have fallen from the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I do not think that, whilst he has expressed himself to be a friend of Ireland and desirous of securing some expression of opinion from the House favorable to the principle of Home Rule, he has adopted the best means calculated to secure the result he says he desires so much. On the contrary, I think, when he opened his observations and counselled his leader, so far as he was concerned, to adhere to the original resolution which was laid upon the Table and not to accept the equally comprehensive but far more dignified course for this House that has been suggested by the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, that he made a very great mistake indeed. As for myself, I feel that no one can question my motives or my sincerity in this matter. I can point to the fact, and I do so with pride, that in the city of Montreal there was organized the first Home Rule Association that ever was organized on the continent of America; that the president of that association was my old and valued and patriotic friend, Mr. Edward Murphy; and that I had the honor of being, under that old patriot always true to the cause, the first vice-president of that association. Ever afterwards, whenever the occasion required, I felt that my course was plain, whatever my conduct might expose me to—and it did sometimes expose me to something that was not very pleasant for one who had political aspirations; that my duty was plain as a man, as the son of an Irishman and of an Irish mother, as one who had a deep interest in the welfare of the land of my forefathers and who wished to see peace and harmony existing there and existing here in Canada amongst those of my race and those of other races who have made this country our home, despite any inconvenience or unpopularity in certain quarters that my conduct might have exposed me to, whether it was on the occasion of the visit of Mr. Parnell to the city of Montreal, when he spoke in the Theatre Royal, and when I said in his presence what I say now in your presence and in the presence of the representatives of this country, that I hoped the time was not far distant when, by the labor of the patriotic sons of Ireland, the day might dawn when they could exclaim in one breath "God save Ireland" and "God save the Queen"; or when, again, Mr. Parnell was imprisoned by the Government of Mr. Gladstone in Kilmalham gaol, and I and my friends called a meeting to express our sentiments on that occasion. However, it is not my desire to refer further to these facts, except in order to vindicate the position I take to-day, and to state here that I for one would not support the amendment that has been brought in here by the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue if I did not feel that it was better calculated to serve the purpose that we have in view, that every good and honest citizen has in view, than the resolution which was proposed in the first place by the hon. the leader of the Opposition. I desire to approach this subject in a conciliatory spirit. I do not wish for one moment to cast any doubt upon the motives that may have inspired this action, but our motives have been attacked, our course, or rather the course which has been suggested by the representative of our people in this Government, has been attacked, and I think, without at all wishing to disparage in any way the motives of the hon. the leader of the Opposition, that there are some circumstances surrounding his action in this matter which are far more suspicious than anything which can be attributed

to the hon. gentleman who has proposed the amendment. There is no doubt that parliamentary contest is perhaps the strongest prop to a man's faith. The hon. gentleman has said he is sincere in this matter so far as wishing to eliminate all party feeling and all party advantage therefrom. I am obliged, under parliamentary courtesy, to believe that, but my credulity is put to a very strong test. I think, after all, if we look at some of the circumstances surrounding the bringing in of this resolution, we will be struck very forcibly with a certain number of omissions which the hon. gentleman has made. In the first place, there are in this House a certain number of gentlemen of Irish extraction and Irishmen by birth as well, and he never consulted one of those gentlemen before bringing in this resolution. But there was more than that. The fact that this resolution was brought in as an amendment to going into Committee of Supply must have impressed everyone in this House that, after all, there was something about such a procedure that would cast a little doubt upon the sincerity of the hon. gentleman's motives. But there was a great deal more than that, and I think this is perhaps the gravest omission of all. That was not the fact that the Irish members were not approached, because, so far as the Irish Catholic members are concerned, unfortunately there are only eight of us in this House, and, perhaps, although I believe there is no personal ill-feeling between them and the gentlemen opposite, there might have been a hesitancy on the part of the hon. gentleman to approach them, but there could not be anything like a hesitancy, there should not have been anything like a hesitancy, if there was an honest desire that that resolution should pass; it was absolutely necessary that the hon. gentleman should have addressed himself, at all events, if not to the rank and file, to the leader of the French Canadian party in this House, without whose sanction and without whose approval, and without whose influence, perhaps, no such resolution could be carried at all. All these things were omitted. But we have still other circumstances that must attract very grave attention in this matter. We know that the *Globe* newspaper is supposed to be, to a very great extent, the organ of the hon. gentleman opposite, and that paper last week told us that the hon. the leader of the Opposition, not commanding a majority in this House, could not be expected to bring forward anything of this kind. He could not command a majority for anything he might bring forward, and therefore it was his duty not to bring it forward at all. But there was more than that in connection with this, and I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without drawing the attention of the House to it. There was, in the first place, as I have said, the statement of what claims to be an Irish newspaper giving the views of Irishmen all over the Dominion. Its own constituency will not satisfy it; it professes to speak for Irishmen throughout the length and breadth of the land, and it especially speaks in praise of everything that is said and everything that is done by the hon. gentleman opposite; and what was the position that that particular organ of the Liberal party placed the hon. gentleman on this side of the House in, whose duty it is supposed to have been to propose this resolution? I will read a brief extract from that paper's Ottawa correspondence, published on the 15th April, 1886, only a couple of weeks ago. This is what is said:

"It is said that a resolution will be proposed in Parliament sympathizing with Mr. Gladstone and the Irish people on the prospect of obtaining Home Rule for Ireland. Should this be proposed from the Ministerial side of the House it will be understood at once as a Tory dodge to win back Irish support. It is hard to see, however, in what way it can benefit them. . . . The Irish people are not to be humbugged. The records of both parties are before them. The press has shown the feeling prevailing in either camp. But the time has passed for resolutions of the kind."

That is what the Irish members of this House, at all events, were met with on this occasion. I do not think that I can let this opportunity pass without corroborating what has been said by the Minister of Inland Revenue with regard to our feeling on this subject. There is not one in this House who would not go to the utmost limit in voting for any resolution that might benefit Ireland in any sense that was thought for the best by the truest friends of Ireland; and, Sir, in order that we might arrive at a just conclusion, the friends of the cause, those who were pointed to as having the duty imposed upon them of attending to this matter, met together; meeting together we discussed the question not in a party spirit, not in a spirit of seeking to achieve any party advantage, but every gentleman in this House, or in the Senate, who was present at that meeting, is to day a living witness that the question at that meeting was: Will it be for the advantage of Ireland that such a resolution should be brought forward? In view of what has been said in the press, in view of the imputation which was cast upon us, in view, more particularly, of the unanimous vote cast in this House in 1882, a more emphatic expression than which this could not possibly have been given, we thought, Sir, it would be impossible for us to secure anything more forcible, and that it was desirable to let that matter stand before the world, before the eyes of Mr. Gladstone, who had received it and who had returned it in the contemptuous manner that has been referred to, that was the unanimous expression of this Parliament. It had never been appealed. No one had stood up in this Parliament and asked that a different opinion should be recorded, and we felt under the circumstances, and not only those gentlemen, but the best Home Rulers in this country whom I had consulted, those who had given their time, their money and their energy to the cause, also felt that unless we could secure a unanimous vote again in this House, or something tantamount thereto, it was in the interest of Ireland that the old resolutions should stand, which had been carried by a unanimous vote, and that they should not be disturbed. It was under those circumstances that we adopted the course we did. The hon. Minister was approached by one association in the Dominion of Canada, and that is the only association that has spoken throughout the length and breadth of the land upon this subject. No other Irish society, either Protestant or Catholic, had approached the hon. gentleman, either by delegation or by letter. Not one gentleman had ever approached me. I had gone to the city of Montreal, I had appeared on the public platform there at the meeting presided over by His Worship the Mayor of Montreal, when those resolutions of the city of Montreal were passed. I had taken part in that meeting, and not one man, not one president of an organisation, had sought to impress upon me the necessity of having an expression of opinion from this Parliament. As I have said, I went out of my way to consult the best friends of Home Rule, and if we did not proceed it was from motives of prudence, from a true, sincere and heartfelt desire that what had been well done for Ireland, should remain well done, and should stand before the world as the expression of opinion of the Parliament of Canada. Sir, we had the organisation to which I have referred; we had the Montreal *True Witness*, the weekly edition of the newspaper to which I have referred; and we had the expression by the *Catholic Record*, of London, as to what this Parliament should do under those circumstances; but I failed to gather in the resolutions of the leader of the Opposition anything like an attempt to follow the advice that was given by either of these organs of public opinion. The leader of the Opposition has undertaken to present a humble Address to Her Majesty. Now, Sir, neither one nor the other of those papers asked for a humble Address to Her Majesty.

If we refer to the *Catholic Record*, in which an appeal was made to the Irish members of this House—certainly not couched in very inviting or courteous language, in a portion of it where we were told not to be “dumb brutes,” but there was another portion of it which I will read, as I do not wish anything to go upon the *Hansard* which would in any way mar the effect of the proceedings of to-day, which, I trust, will end harmoniously. The London *Catholic Record* said:

“It is now in order to the Dominion Parliament to follow up its resolutions of April 20th, 1882, to their logical conclusion, and give Mr. Gladstone the benefit of a hearty expression of sympathy.”

According to this paper, it is a question of passing a resolution of sympathy with Mr. Gladstone himself; something, no doubt, in the form that has come to us to-day in the public press from the Province of Nova Scotia, where Attorney General White introduced a Government resolution referring to Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill, and resolved:

“That this House desires to record its warm sympathy with the noble efforts put forth by the Premier of Great Britain in the direction of giving Home Rule to Ireland, and expresses its sincere hope that his efforts may be crowned with success.”

This body does not feel it necessary to present an Address to Her Majesty, but I may say that the course which has been adopted by the leader of the Opposition not only does not meet the views of those who may be supposed to speak for the Irish people of the Dominion, but it meets with their entire disapprobation. I think the House will admit that I am perfectly right in saying so when I refer them to the proceedings that took place a short time ago in the Quebec Legislature, when Mr. Carbray presented a resolution, probably a great deal more comprehensive than the one which has been presented by the leader of the Opposition in this House, and the resolution of Mr. Carbray was denounced as an act of toyism, as an act of funkism, as an act unworthy of the occasion. The resolution was as follows:—

“We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Quebec, in Parliament assembled, desire, in our name and on behalf of the people whom we represent, to renew the expression of our unwavering loyalty and devotion to Your Majesty's person and Government.”

“That this House, always sensible to everything aiding the greater welfare, progress and happiness of every section of the Empire, desires to record its warm appreciation and great pleasure on the initiation in the Imperial Parliament of legislation of a character to give a local government to Ireland, and the prospect of an early action with a view of an equitable settlement of the land question there, whereby the position of the tillers of the soil will be improved to a large and beneficial extent, without injustice being done to the present land owners. We pray that Your Majesty may be spared long years to reign over your devoted and loyal subjects.”

Here, then, was a resolution embodying all the sentiments that are contained in the resolution proposed by the hon. gentleman opposite. Here was a resolution addressed to Her Majesty the Queen, just as this resolution is addressed to Her Majesty the Queen, and yet we find this organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, which assumes to speak for all the people of Canada so far as the Irish race is concerned, writing this particular article in reference to the motion in question:

“The Legislature of Quebec is to be given an opportunity to express, in the name of the Canadian people, its sympathy with the struggles of the Irish race for self-government, and to extend to Mr. Gladstone its congratulations on having had the courage to introduce a Home Rule Bill in the British Parliament. Hon. Mr. Morier has presented a set of resolutions which are to the point. Mr. Carbray has also moved in the matter, but his intention is to present an humble Address to Her Majesty the Queen. Now we would like to know what the Queen has got to do in this matter or why her name should be dragged in at all? Mr. Gladstone has had to fight against the Queen to bring in his Home Rule Bill. It is not Her Majesty that we have to thank for the Ministerial recognition of the principle of Home Rule for Ireland, it is Mr. Gladstone. Consequently it is the latter, and not the former, that should be made the object of our admiration and the recipient of our congratulations. Under the circumstances Mr. Carbray's proposed Address is out of order; it is not only uncalled for, it is undeserved.”

MR. CURRAN.

That was the view expressed in this rather forcible language by the organ in question. We have on another date the following in an editorial article in the same paper:

“In view of this happy turn which events have taken, would it not be opportune and even beneficial to the cause of justice and freedom, which it has already pleaded, for the Dominion Parliament to imitate the example of Quebec and other Legislatures abroad, and send across to the Grand Old Man a message of sympathy and of encouragement in the great and noble work he has undertaken to accomplish in face of colossal difficulties and obstacles? *The Post* thinks it would be a meritorious act on the part of the Federal House to do so. Mr. Gladstone himself would esteem it so.”

No doubt, this gentleman was in the confidence of Mr. Gladstone. Again, in another article, we find:

“Who will, then, move in the House that Gladstone is deserving of the thanks of the Canadian people for his scheme to give Ireland Home Rule?”

Again, in another article we find:

“Is there any reason why the Dominion Parliament should not follow in the footsteps of the Quebec Assembly and adopt resolutions of congratulation to Mr. Gladstone on the question of Home Rule for Ireland? There is no reason that we can see. The Federal Parliament has already placed itself on record as being in favor of self-government for the Irish people. This fact to our mind is a special reason why it should to-day tender the hand of sympathy and of encouragement to the statesman who had the courage to espouse the principle of Home Rule and advocate it from the Treasury benches in the British House of Commons.”

That resolution proposed by Mr. Carbray in the Quebec Legislature, which corresponds so far as it goes with the resolution proposed by the leader of the Opposition, was withdrawn, and a special expression of the thanks of the Quebec Legislature was proposed to Mr. Gladstone on account of the stand he had taken. We, therefore, find, on referring to the journal from which I have been quoting, that the position taken by the leader of the Opposition on this subject is endorsed, whilst the very same motion and the very same action on the part of Mr. Carbray, who, by the way, is a Conservative in the Province of Quebec, was denounced in the most forcible language that the editor could call to his assistance. I say further that, in view of the statement made that if hon. members in this House had brought forward a resolution asking this House to pronounce upon the question of Home Rule—we have it there in black and white—it would be a mere political dodge on our part. I say that if I or any other hon. member had come forward and proposed to this honorable House a resolution asking that a humble Address be sent to Her Majesty the Queen thanking her or thanking the Administration for what has taken place, I or any other hon. member would have been denounced as a coward, as unworthy of the position of member in this House, as not representing the sentiments of the Irish people, that I should have proposed a resolution to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone and left Her Majesty aside altogether. If we proceed to consider this question further, I ask this House if there were not very great difficulties in the way of again presenting a resolution of this kind. I have spoken not merely to friends, but I have consulted gentlemen of different nationalities and races in this House as to the advisability of bringing forward a resolution on this subject. A very great difficulty indeed exists, as has been pointed out in such a plain manner by the Minister of Inland Revenue, in view of the reception which our last Address received, when Mr. Gladstone himself advised Her Majesty to tell us in plain language that while the Government of England would always be ready to receive any advice we might have to offer upon Canadian affairs, yet, so far as regards Imperial concerns, Canada had better mind her own business. Should we have attempted, without the assurance of carrying a resolution by a very large majority, in view of the opinion expressed by several hon. gentlemen who may be depended upon to support Home Rule, I ask would it have been prudent for us to have proceeded exactly in the same manner and in the very tracks we had gone before, when

we were brought face to face with this snubbing that was given by the Imperial Government, and which remains to the present day. For, whilst Mr. Gladstone has upon many occasions of late, it appears, referred to congratulatory addresses forwarded to him in regard to the Home Rule question, there is one thing certain—that in all his sayings there is not one word as to what he stated to the Parliament of Canada when that answer was sent by his own Government. There is perhaps another view to take. We have that statement from the Earl of Kimberley before us. Every man in this Parliament, every man in this country, is aware of the existence of that answer, and it would look, perhaps, a little satirical were we to adopt a humble Address to Her Majesty to-day, after the strong position has been taken by him when we were told to mind our own business in Imperial affairs; we would again, by this very occasion, just remind the hon. gentleman of the little mistake he made in 1882, and remind him that after all the advice of Canada was not so bad, if he had taken it at the time. Now, Sir, the substance of the hon. gentleman's resolution may be all right enough, but according to his own friends, according to common-sense ideas and a due regard for our own dignity, we cannot adopt by any possibility the form which he has adopted, the form which brought this answer from the Earl of Kimberley, whilst we have an equally effective mode, a mode that will involve no discount towards this House, if it exists; a mode by which this Parliament places upon its records, and publishes to the world what its views are upon this question in its present state in the Imperial Parliament. Now, Sir, I think, under these circumstances, there is, an admirable opportunity, if the hon. gentleman is sincere in the desire which he has expressed, to have unanimity on this question, to run no risk to strengthen the cause of justice to Ireland—I say if the hon. gentleman is sincere, not only in view of the embodiment of the principles that are there enumerated in the amendment of my hon. friend—I say he has an admirable opportunity of showing that there is no desire upon his part to make this a party or political question, a question out of which political capital may be made, because it would show his anxiety to do good to the cause which he has espoused; and as we are all laboring together, and all claiming to be animated by the same spirit, nothing, I think, will evince that more than by the hon. gentleman subscribing to the amendment which has been proposed by my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue, despite the advice given him by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey). Now, Sir, I think that there ought not to be any need, on an occasion of this kind, to address the House where Home Rule exists in the full plenitude of its beneficence any question, any word, any statement in advocacy of the principle that is now being laid before us. I trust, Sir, that there are not, at all events, many in this House who do not approve of Home Rule for Ireland. I do not believe that there are many gentlemen in this House who would stand up before their constituents in any part of the country and declare that they did not desire that the Irish people in Ireland should enjoy the privileges that are enjoyed by Irish, and English, and Scotch, and French in the Dominion of Canada. I do not believe that any man in this House would go before his constituents and be listened to approvingly in the utterance of such sentiments. I trust, therefore, that there will be, at all events as regards this amendment of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, unanimity or a strong majority in this House in its favor. I will say to those who may not believe in Home Rule for Ireland that, under existing circumstances, that question has become, you may say, a fixed fact in the politics of Great Britain. One of the greatest men in Ireland to-day, a member of the British Parliament, Justin McCarthy, has said in a letter recently published that this present measure now before the House,

which, to use the words of Mr. Parnell himself, is one in which there are blots and blemishes, which must be removed ere it will be acceptable to the Irish people—I say Justin McCarthy has stated that in his opinion this Bill may not become law at present. But, Sir, as sure as there is a kind Providence which watches over the fate of nations, Ireland is destined to get justice in the matter of Home Rule. I would point out to those hon. gentlemen to whom I am now specially addressing myself, a statement made by a very distinguished statesman of England in 1880. I refer to Mr. Lowe, who had abandoned his former position with regard to the extension of the franchise, and who thus gave his reasons in a speech on his re-election for London University:

"You took me as your representative at a time when you knew that I differed from the mass of the Liberal party on the subject of the franchise. That was a kindness I shall never forget. What has happened with regard to that question of the franchise? Why, this. One time the subject has been settled by those with whom I acted at that time—the Tories themselves. You see that Sir Stafford Northcote has been complaining of the masses of people who have sprung up everywhere as if they were the dragon's teeth. But who sowed the dragon's teeth? This has to be said to the credit or discredit of the Tory Government—that this greater number of people have the franchise because the Tory Government, out-trumping the Whigs, gave it to them. Well, gentlemen, now comes the question of the county franchise. I am a practical man. You know that I fought as long as there was a possibility of success, but I am now in this dilemma: if I go on any further I must unite with the Tories, who have already decided and betrayed me—(laughter and cheers)—or else I must confess myself, as I humbly do, utterly beaten in this matter. I must confess that public opinion is entirely against me, and give up all opposition whatever. Gentlemen, I prefer the latter course. (Cheers.) Politics are a practical science, and, as I have said from the first, what I desired was that the subject should be fairly brought before the country, and that we should have its decision upon the question. Well, it has been brought before the country in this election, and the decision of the Liberal party has been, so far as I know, absolutely unanimous. I, therefore, have nothing to do but to bow to that decision."

And, Mr. Speaker, what has taken place in the question referred to will take place in this instance. This has become a question of practical politics in the Imperial Parliament, and if this Bill of the Right Hon. Mr. Gladstone be not carried, the Tories will out-trump Mr. Gladstone at an early day, and a broader and more comprehensive Bill of Home Rule will be brought in by the Conservatives. I know it has been urged on many occasions that this question of Home Rule involves separation from the Empire. I have never believed that. I have given many years of study to this question in my own humble way, and I am convinced that the honor, the glory, the power and the prestige of England, Ireland and Scotland are bound up together, just as in this country the people who speak the English language would never consent for a moment that a division should take place in the glory of this country, that has been conjointly spread upon it by the peoples who speak the two languages in this country; that the English-speaking people would never consent to allow the glory cast upon our history by our French-Canadian brethren, from the days of Jacques Cartier, and later, the days when the settlements at Quebec and Montreal grew up, and the glorious events which, in the *Relations des Jésuites* took place, are narrated and the glorious events that are chronicled in *Les Relations des Jésuites* took place, and everything connected with the power and the prestige that has been given to this country by the French-Canadian people—I say, just as we could never allow that glory and that prestige to be taken away, so, with regard to the people of Ireland, they feel that they have cast a halo of glory around the British Empire; they feel that they have embellished the literature of that Empire; they feel that their poets and their orators, their scholars and their statesmen, their men in every position of life, by their genius have enhanced the glory of that Empire. They feel, speaking the language of Richard Lalor Shiel, that on many a battle-field the blood of the peoples of England, of Ireland, and of Scotland, has been shed together;

in the same deep pits in many lands, their bodies have been deposited, and the green sward of spring now covers their commingled remains. The Irish people feel and know what they have contributed to the Empire, and they know what they would lose by total separation from that Empire; they know that England, Ireland and Scotland, as separate nations, could never possess that commanding influence in the world which they possess to-day. But the people of Ireland demand, and with God's blessing they will have, Home Rule there as we have Home Rule here; and in the words of the amendment that has been submitted by my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue, the result will be that peace and contentment will reign in the land, that the Irish people will be happy and prosperous, and that the bonds of union between Ireland, England and Scotland, will be strengthened, not weakened thereby, and the future prosperity of the Empire secured.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that it is right that any Irishman should get a groan in this House. I claim to be an Irishman just as much as the gentlemen who have already addressed the House on this question. I believe I am just as true an Irishman as any who sits within this Chamber. I was born on the old sod; I lived there for a good many years; I have visited it and travelled through it frequently. I love and reverence the green hills of Ireland just as much as any man in this House; and when I, in my humble way, rise to offer a few words in the interest of this important question I think I am just as fairly entitled to a hearing as any man who sits in this House. Now, Sir, I regret the course that hon. gentlemen opposite have deemed it proper to take on this occasion. I should have liked very much that the question had been received by hon. gentlemen opposite in the same spirit in which it was presented. I am quite sure the hon. leader of the Opposition took the position he did honestly and earnestly desirous of strengthening the hands of the Hon. Mr. Gladstone who has assumed the enormous task of endeavoring to secure Home Rule for Ireland. I believe hon. gentlemen opposite would have accepted the proposition had it not emanated from the hon. leader of the Opposition. If the hon. leader of the Government had presented that resolution, they would have held up their hands and yelled in joy that it had been presented to this House; but simply because the hon. leader of the Opposition brings it forward, after waiting for weeks—yes, for months—for hon. gentlemen opposite who have the majority of the members of this House at their backs, they refused to support it. Why did they not take action themselves? Did they consider the question one of so little importance as to be not worthy of their attention? The hon. gentleman who has just sit down has told us that the Irishmen of this House and the Irishmen of the Senate had a meeting and talked the whole question over; and he said that every Irishman in this House and in the Senate was present. Well, Sir, I claim to be an Irishman, and I was not there; I heard nothing of the meeting, and I do not believe there is an Irishman on this side of the House who heard anything of it. I would like to know if the hon. leader of the Opposition heard anything of it?

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. CURRAN. I spoke of Irish Catholic members and Senators.

Mr. BLAKE. It is a Catholic question, is it?

Mr. CURRAN. No, it is not, but you are trying to make a Grit question of it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am sorry the hon. gentleman is so exceedingly narrow-minded on this question. I would like to know if the resolution carried in this House in 1882 was carried only by the votes of Irish Catholic members. I

Mr. CURRAN.

would like to know if both Catholic and Protestant members did not support that resolution. Mr. Parnell is not a Catholic, and why should the hon. gentleman narrow the question down to Catholics? No doubt he wanted to feel, and find out quietly what would be the prospect of carrying this resolution by hon. gentlemen opposite, and what would be the political effect of introducing the question; and, after considering that, he probably decided in his own mind that it would be better simply to have the Minister of Inland Revenue send a despatch across the Atlantic on behalf of the Irishmen of Canada. I cannot understand why he should claim the right to send such a despatch on behalf of the Irishmen of Canada. At any rate, they thought it proper to jilt the matter in that way; and now, when the hon. leader of the Opposition, after two months for them to move, has brought forward the question, they find that the wind has been taken out of their sails, and they anxiously ask themselves: What course can we take; it will never do to go to the country with the leader of the Opposition, introducing a resolution for Home Rule for Ireland; it will never do to allow him to carry away the laurels; we must try if we cannot in some way share the glory and popularity of having passed such a resolution. And in order to do that, the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue has brought forward his amendment. Now, if we could take the resolution that has been presented by the hon. leader of the Opposition and the amendment that has been presented by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue and place those two resolutions in the hands of Mr. Gladstone and in the hands of Mr. Parnell, I venture to say that their decision would be, let us have the resolution of the hon. leader of the Opposition. That is what suits our purpose. Why, in addressing Mr. Gladstone, do you think a resolution of this House would strengthen his hands or induce him more earnestly to give attention to the question? No; what he wants is a resolution asking the Queen and Crown of England to lend aid and encouragement to him in the tremendous struggle he has undertaken. We have had a little experience in this country with regard to the question of Home Rule, and are therefore in a position to speak with some authority on that subject. We know the differences that existed among our Provinces before Confederation; we can well remember the old political struggles that took place, when one Province was set against the other, and we are all glad to think that the days of those unfortunate differences are past, owing chiefly to Confederation. We are therefore in a better position to offer advice to the Crown than any other portion of the colonies, and it is only just to the people of Ireland that we should sympathise with the efforts made in their behalf, and show our sympathy and encouragement by petitioning the Crown to yield to those efforts. There is another point, Sir, to which I wish to call your attention. For many years we have been spending large sums in trying to bring out immigrants from Ireland and other portions of the British Isles, and I believe our efforts and our money have been to a great extent uselessly sacrificed, owing to the ill-feeling that existed in the minds of the Irish people with regard to British rule. I believe if years ago Ireland had got Home Rule, we would to-day have more Irishmen living in Canada, which would be a decided advantage to us. Any man who will travel through Ireland, as I have and witnessed the evidence of ancient greatness on every hand and the unfortunate condition of things to-day which stand out in strong contrast to those evidences of past grandeur, will come to the conclusion that something is wanted. He will easily see that Ireland has not been progressing and that there is evident necessity, and the evidence of the necessity that something should be granted in the way of Home Rule is to be seen on every hand and to be heard in the expressions of the people, giving vent to the

almost unanimous desire for some change of that kind. If Ireland got Home Rule, she would use it cautiously and carefully, knowing that the eyes of the world would be turned upon her to see whether she would really use the privilege granted to her with prudence and care. I believe the Catholic majority would deal out to the Protestant minority an ample share of free treatment, and that the latter would not suffer in the slightest. I shall never believe anything else until I see the measure of Home Rule proposed by Mr. Gladstone put in operation, and see it fail, which latter event, at present, I do not think at all probable. I believe it is the incumbent duty of this House to express our opinion on this question, and not to present our resolution in the emasculated style proposed by the Minister of Inland Revenue. The hon. gentleman who last spoke appeared to challenge the sincerity of the leader of the Opposition. I cannot understand why the hon. gentleman should challenge his sincerity. I think the leader of the Opposition has given ample evidence of his sincerity, first, by introducing the resolution in a broad and comprehensive style, and, second, by the very admirable speech which he delivered on that occasion. Is there a gentleman in this House who sympathises with the Irish movement, who could take exception to a single word in that speech? Did not the leader of the Opposition try to impress on the House the absolute necessity that its expression of opinion should be unanimous, not as a party question, but as an expression of Canadian public sentiment, with the object of strengthening Mr. Gladstone's hands by securing to him the prestige which would arise from our action and our experience in the matter of Home Rule. The hon. gentleman also stated that the leader of the Opposition had introduced the measure on his own responsibility, without consulting anybody in the House. That is not true. As far as I am concerned, I can speak as an Irishman, and I believe he did not confine his views to the Irishmen in the House or the Catholic Irishmen on this side as did the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman said he consulted the Catholics of the House and the Catholics of the Senate, but the leader of the Opposition did not confine his opinions to Catholics or Protestants. He is not accustomed to proceed in that way, and before the hon. gentleman should undertake to say that the leader of the Opposition consulted nobody, he should have taken the trouble to enquire a little into the facts. Probably he thought that the leader of the Opposition proceeded in the way the hon. gentleman did himself. The hon. gentleman also spoke with regard to the attitude of reading the *Globe* can come to no other conclusion than that the *Globe* is a consistent advocate of Home Rule. Its course on that question has been advocated in that bold and liberal spirit which that newspaper agitates every question it takes in hand. But what has been the course of the *Mail*? The *Mail* played shy for a long time. It followed the course which is usually followed by the leader of the Government in an important question. It wanted, first, to see how the wind would blow, to see what course would be taken by its leaders, and after hesitating a long time, it mustered courage enough to come out and express opposition to Home Rule. Irishmen have not much to thank the *Mail* for. They will be able to see through the course taken by the *Mail* and by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and I do not believe they will be a party to this scheme of blinding the eyes of those who sympathise with Home Rule and hoodwinking the Irish population. The people will see through this thin garment of hypocrisy, and give the leader of the Opposition credit for his sincerity, notwithstanding the efforts made by hon. gentlemen opposite to decry and distort his motives. I am exceedingly sorry to see that hon. gentlemen opposite should play dog-in-the-manger in the way they are attempting to do, simply because they are not honored with having intro-

duced the resolution, because they lost their opportunity. They waited day after day and week after week, they felt the pulse of the outside press, and no doubt they consulted their political leader. They studied the question, they were approached by Irishmen in the city of Ottawa and no doubt from elsewhere, they were written to, they were advised, they were encouraged, they were urged, they were pressed to bring in this resolution, but all the pressure and all the encouragement they got failed to have the desired effect. Then, when the resolution is introduced, they begin to see that they have lost a grand opportunity, they have thrown away their changes, they have sacrificed the opportunity of making themselves popular, and, in order, if possible, to turn the tide of venom and ill-feeling and contempt which they naturally deserve from the Irishmen outside of this House whom they claim to represent and to lead, they want now to kick up a little dust and try if they can get an amendment introduced, try to get some little change made, and try to persuade the people: "Did we not do the business after all; it was not Mr. Blake at all, it was we." Do you not see what has pinched the Minister of Inland Revenue? Look at the devoted utterances that hon. gentleman used on that occasion. Read the utterances of the member for Montreal (Mr. Carran) on that occasion. Could anyone speak in a more patriotic and glowing style on the advantages of Home Rule in Ireland? Yes, they tried it in that shape, and no doubt they will try some more of the same kind. I suppose we shall have an address from others on that side of the House on this subject. No doubt the member for Montreal and the Minister of Inland Revenue will not be allowed to stand alone. No doubt the First Minister will address the House. We expect him to. No doubt we shall hear from the Minister of Customs, he is an Irishman.

Mr. BOWELL. You are wrong.

Mr. McMULLEN. We also expect the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to speak. Surely he is going to say a word on this question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. And the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. White), surely we will have a word from him on this question.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I am opposed to it.

Mr. McMULLEN. All these men will rise, and they will deplore the unfortunate spirit that actuated the leader of the Opposition in introducing a question of this kind without consulting hon. gentlemen opposite. It was a sad thing, and on him must rest the responsibility of the defeat, if it is defeated. They are sorry he has placed it in the unfortunate position in which it is placed before the House, and that they have been compelled to take the stand they have, and it is only in the interest of Home Rule they are doing it. If it were not that they are so devoted to the cause of Home Rule and to the cause of Ireland, they would sacrifice a little to meet the views of the leader of the Opposition, but they are so devoted to that cause that they dare not allow this resolution to pass, they must amend it in some way, it is so cruel that it is placed in such a position, they feel that the Queen would not be honored to receive an address based upon such a resolution without passing their glossy hands over it and putting it in proper shape. No doubt we shall hear a good deal in regard to that, and a great many expressions of regret that the hon. the leader of the Opposition did not take time. He did it too hurriedly, he got it up too quickly, it is badly worded, it is a pity it is presented in that shape, and a great many other faults of that kind will be found, and they will try to show that it is a deplorable thing that

he should have permitted himself to be driven to bring in this resolution without consulting gentlemen opposite and getting them to put it in decent shape so that it might look creditable. I deplore the spirit that has been evinced by hon. gentlemen opposite in connection with this question. If they had accepted the action of the hon. the leader of the Opposition in the spirit in which it was tendered, I believe this question might have passed this House unanimously, and they would have had just as much credit by taking that course as they will have now by the course they have adopted, just as much credit by casting in their lot unanimously with the hon. the leader of the Opposition as by attempting in this chess-playing kind of style to interfere and to dabble with the resolution, and to try to cut and carve it so that, when they go to the country in a few months, they will say: "Why, it was we, after all that prepared that resolution; had we permitted it to go home in the shape in which it was prepared by the leader of the Opposition it would have been deplorable, it would not have suited Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Parnell would have been horrified, the country would have risen, and said, are there no men in Canada able to prepare something decent to send to the Queen instead of sending a home resolution in this style in place of something like the production of a man of brains and sense." But, no matter how they may talk, they have got into an unfortunate dilemma, and they will try to struggle out of it as best they can. They will all try to show willingness. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue has given the one, and according to that they will all preach and prattle the doctrine he has laid down as to the desirability of sending an address merely to Mr. Gladstone and not to the Queen. I am rather disposed to think that hon. gentlemen opposite, notwithstanding all their vaunted loyalty as Conservatives, are disposed to ignore the Queen in this question. They do not seem to be disposed to acknowledge the Queen. The idea of men led by the First Minister daring to petition the First Minister of England on a matter of this kind without sending it to the Queen! I am surprised. A knight, a man honored by the Queen, several of his colleagues honored by the Queen, to think that they would send it to the First Minister instead of the Queen, instead of to the Crown! Surely the First Minister has not had the conceit of this matter. Surely he has not been consulted. Surely he would not propose to ignore the Queen. He is disposed to express a great deal of loyalty, and, whenever any question comes up on which the Queen might be approached or the Government of England, he displays a great deal of loyalty and respect for the Crown and the Queen. We all do, and I am sorry that hon. gentlemen are disposed to reflect upon Her Majesty the Queen in connection with this question. If we petition at all, is not the Queen the proper party to address? Certainly she is. If any other colonies of the Empire were to address a resolution to this House on a question of vital importance to this Dominion of ours, and that petition was sent to the First Minister of this House instead of to the Governor General in Council, I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite would say it was a very strange proceeding for these men to take, to address the First Minister; did they not know that we had a Governor General, a representative of the Queen? Why did they not address the petition to the representative of the Queen in the country? And they would stand up and hold up their hands in holy horror, to think we should dare to receive a petition of that kind. I am surprised, with all their boasted loyalty and boasted admiration for our Queen—and we have a noble Queen—that they should talk in this way. I think it would be a great pity to ignore her right to be approached on this occasion. They may claim that the answer we got before was not an answer such as we would like to get, but there has been a great deal of change in the

MR. McMULLEN.

feeling in Ireland and England on this question since that petition was sent home. The people of England have been dealing with that question; they have had a general election; that question has been one of the vital questions at that general election, and is now the question of paramount importance in England. I say, when that is the case, we have a perfect right, as a humble colony claiming loyalty to our Queen, and having had the experience we have, to offer our views humbly and courteously on this question. We have a right to exercise that right, and if we fail to do that, we are not doing justice to those who are in jeopardy, and who are trying to secure for themselves that measure of representation and self-government that we so much glory in ourselves. We boast of our system of home rule in Canada, and I believe it would have been a greater success than it has been if the Dominion had been presided over by men less disposed to dabble with questions that legitimately belong to the separate Provinces, and allowing them to exercise their home rule without interference. I hope that we shall have a general expression of opinion on this subject. For my part I have no hesitation in expressing myself cordially in unison with the view of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. I believe that is the proper view. I believe the Irishmen of this country, if the question were submitted to them by counties, would endorse the view expressed by the leader of the Opposition, and I believe that is the view that will be most likely to assist Mr. Gladstone in his struggles on behalf of Home Rule. I think we should not allow these little bickerings to enter this discussion; I believe politics should have been banished from it. I am sure the leader of the Opposition was anxious that all political feeling should be set aside, and that we should all approach it in a spirit of anxious desire to assist Mr. Gladstone in the effort he is making. But hon. gentlemen opposite have chosen to take another course. Oh, politics is a terrible thing. A man cannot possibly introduce any question from this side of the House but he must be charged with a desire of making political capital. The hon. leader of the Opposition is charged with having some sinister design in view, with trying to strengthen the hands of his followers. Well, I am sure he did not steal a march on hon. gentlemen opposite. If he had introduced it in the very beginning of the Session, without allowing hon. gentlemen opposite an opportunity of acting, then he might fairly be charged with having stolen a march upon them. Did he do that? No, he has waited till the ninth week of this Session. He has given the hon. gentleman for Montreal (Mr. Cunniff) and his associates ample time to have moved. They have had eight or nine weeks to prepare their resolution, to consult their chief and his co-Ministers—they have waited all this time without taking any action. Still they have not moved. There must have been some secret cause at the bottom, and they did not think it worth while to move, but all at once the leader of the Opposition introduced his motion, and then they arose in their might and felt it their duty to express their earnest desire that something of a different kind should be introduced and carried through. They then became alive, they shook off the shackles of laziness and rose up. Then they were ready to act, but they were never ready to act before. I suppose if the leader of the Opposition had not acted, the probabilities are that you, Mr. Speaker, would have left the Chair for the last time and the Governor General would have given his assent to every Act we have passed here, before they would have acted; and if we had done that the probabilities are that they would have gone to the country and said: Well, we were afraid to move on that question, we were afraid of the leader of the Opposition, we did not know what course he would take, we were afraid of these fellows that were following him, and we began to think they were not going to

support us, and we feared we could not carry a resolution through. But we have got the Minister of Inland Revenue the most prominent Irish member in this House to cable home a despatch urging and encouraging Mr. Parnell in his noble undertaking. We did all we could do, all that we possibly dared to risk, in order to promote the cause of Home Rule. But now they have an opportunity of joining hands across the floors of the House in the interests of a country that has been admittedly suffering. There is not a man in this House who will deny that poor, unfortunate Ireland has suffered for years for the want of that measure of Home Rule that we believe would be pleasant to her. They attack the resolution of the leader of the Opposition, and I am sorry to say that there are some men of Irish parentage who have been so neglectful of the honor they owe to their parent land, that in the moment of her struggles, and of Mr. Gladstone's efforts in her behalf, they have stood, while clothed with the honor of being representatives in this House, clothed with the privilege of discharging the duty of representative of constituencies that, in many cases, have a large number of Irishmen—they have stood still for nine weeks without offering one word of encouragement to the leaders of the Home Rule movement, or presenting any resolution in order to back up Mr. Gladstone in the enormous task he has undertaken."

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. McMULLEN. When the House rose, I was endeavoring to present some ideas with reference to what I conceived to be the duty of the representatives in this House on this important question. I endeavored to show what I conceived to be the reasons why the Government had chosen to take the course they have taken in interfering with the resolution that has been presented by the leader on this side of the House. I am sorry that hon. gentlemen opposite have not seen it to be their duty to go further in meeting the views of the leader of the Opposition, than by moving an amendment simply to confirm the resolution we adopted in 1882. I contend we ought to be in a position to go further than that. We have had the experience of four years. We have seen the unfortunate results of the disturbances that have existed in Ireland; we have read from year to year the unfortunate occurrences that have taken place there. I am sure we must be convinced that there must be some necessity for a change in the system of Government, that would remove those unfortunate circumstances that have been so plainly brought before us, and that the House should not say that after all the experiences we have had, after all the experiences we have had ourselves as a confederacy, we are not in a position to go further and simply confirm what we did in 1882. We have had ourselves four years more experience. We enjoy a measure of home rule, which has been a real advantage. It is conceded by each of the Provinces, notwithstanding unfortunate interferences that have taken place between the Dominion Government and the Provinces from time to time, that our condition is better than it was prior to Confederation. Well, then, after having those experiences, and after having seen what we have seen in regard to Ireland, are we not in a position to go further than to re-affirm what we did in 1882. I think we ought to be able to go further, and we are not discharging our duty as fellow-subjects with the people of Ireland if we are not prepared to do so. I would ask if the statesmen of England are not holding different opinions to-day to what they did in 1882. Are not the public men who were hostile to Home Rule then, who characterized it as breaking up the empire and even worse, admitting that some change is necessary? Is Mr. Gladstone

of the same mind to-day as he was four years ago? He is not. He has come to the conclusion that the change is necessary. We have been eye-witnesses of those experiences in Ireland, and if we are not in a position to go further than simply confirm what we did in 1882 we have not been sensible of the incidents that have transpired in the meantime and not been faithful observers of what has passed for years. I contend that we should go further than the resolution itself. If the amendment had added force to the resolution it should have been seriously considered. I must again express regret that the question has not been approached in a spirit of liberality and fairness by hon. gentlemen opposite. I am sorry to think that little political bitterness should influence members on this great question and should interfere with the decision of this House with respect to it. Simply because hon. gentlemen opposite think the leader of the Opposition might make a little capital out of this question, they interfere and actually risk the chance of reaching a conclusion on it such as would be satisfactory to our friends on the other side of the water and such as would in some measure strengthen the hands of Mr. Gladstone. I hope, whatever bitterness may have characterized the discussions so far, we will abandon those little political bickerings and deal with the question fairly, and let us get over the matter with that measure of credit to ourselves which we should like to claim. We may contend about little political questions, but when a subject of this kind affecting a portion of the Empire is brought forward we should be able to bury our political differences and deal with it in a spirit of generosity, kindness and British fair play. Holding that feeling; and being desirous as an Irishman to do everything in my power to aid the efforts being put forth by Mr. Gladstone in favor of Home Rule, I beg to move in amendment to the amendment:

To leave out all the words in the amendment after "that" and insert the following words in addition thereto, after the word "adhesion": "And that this House is confirmed and strengthened by the events which have occurred since the passage of the said address in its convictions that the true interests both of Ireland and the rest of the Empire will be served in the highest degree by the granting of Home Rule to Ireland."

Mr. BURNS. I am afraid, notwithstanding all the professions made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that his actions are not entirely uninfluenced by party considerations. The whole tenor and temper of the speech of the hon. gentleman could only leave the impression on one's mind that political considerations were largely at the bottom of his action and statements. I shall not in any way try to disprove what the hon. gentleman has stated. When he said he was actuated by the desire to secure as far as possible the passage of some measure which would go to strengthen the hands of those who are now endeavoring to strike the chains from off the feet of Ireland; and while giving him credit for being influenced by that motive, I cannot divest myself of the idea that within and behind that there are also political considerations. The observations which he addressed to the House can leave no other impression on my mind, and because that impression is on my mind, I must so express myself. The hon. gentleman, in the course of his speech, has charged the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue with being derelict in his duty to his countryman in not bringing forward, for the consideration of the House, some resolution of this kind. It comes with very ill grace from the hon. gentleman, or from any hon. gentleman in this House, to charge the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue with being now or ever having been derelict in his duty to his countryman. The record of that hon. gentleman, as an Irishman, stands to-day as high in the Dominion of Canada as that of any Irishman, or any man in the Dominion of Canada. In the Province to which he belongs, no name carries with it greater weight than the name of John Costigan, the Minister of

Inland Revenue. He has from time to time proved his devotedness to his countrymen on every occasion which presented itself, he was not slow in advocating their interest when attacked. In 1882, in the face of opposition from his own party, he introduced into this House a series of resolutions, which were carried unanimously, or almost unanimously. What has the hon. gentleman to gain by the introduction of those resolutions? No political advantage for himself; he never sought for any political advantage—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. BURNS. No, he never did. If he had sought for political advantages for himself these advantages might have accrued to him long before that. He was actuated, I am sure, by the sole desire of serving in some way the country he claimed as his own, though he was not a native of it. Prior to 1882 it can be said of him that he proved his devotedness to his countrymen, to their interests—their religious interests especially—on every occasion when they were attacked. Then, I say, it comes with a very poor grace from the hon. gentleman who has just sat down to charge the Minister of Inland Revenue with having in any way deserted his country, or the cause of his country. The facts are as stated by the Minister, that it was suggested to him that resolutions of this kind should be introduced, but after consultation with those with whom he was associated, with his countrymen if you will, it was deemed inexpedient, or unnecessary rather, that resolutions of this nature should be introduced, and why? Because in 1882 the Parliament of Canada had passed resolutions, and we know the treatment those resolutions received. We know the reply which was given to the resolutions; and therefore, in face of that fact, it was deemed unnecessary now, with that record of the opinion of the Canadian Parliament standing before the Imperial Government, to re-introduce similar resolutions. It was because of the conclusion arrived at that the hon. Minister deemed it unnecessary, I say, to take action in the matter. Was the action of the hon. leader of the Opposition a spontaneous action? He said in his speech that he had waited until the last moment, waited to hear from his side of the House. One would be led to infer from that statement that the action of the hon. gentleman was not a spontaneous one. I would ask was it not after that hon. gentleman had been waited upon and asked to move those resolutions, that they were introduced. Was the action one of his own motion? I leave the question to him to answer. At all events current rumor has it that he did not move until he was moved, and we know that as the leader of a party, a great party if you will, in the Dominion of Canada, he was very likely to be influenced by political considerations, and he thought his political interest and the interest of his party could be served by bringing forward these resolutions, in order that he might catch the Irish vote of the Dominion of Canada. Well, the Irish vote of the Dominion of Canada is not so easily caught as that. The Irish voters of the Dominion of Canada can distinguish grain from chaff; they know who their real friends are, and are able to discriminate between those who are their real friends and those who are not. The fact stands to-day in the presence of the House, and it is a fact, that not one Irish Catholic sits in the House except on the Conservative side. What the electors in 1882 did—that is the Irish Catholic portion of them—I feel satisfied they will repeat on the next occasion that presents itself, and therefore the efforts and labors of the hon. gentleman will have all been in vain. I do not wish to trouble the House with any lengthy remarks. No one feels more strongly than I do for the cause of Ireland, my native land. No one feels a stronger desire to see her relieved from the thralldom in which she has been enslaved. No one will go further in rendering a service to his country than I would. I have before my consideration to-night two resolutions. One resolution means the sending of an

Mr. BURNS.

address to Her Majesty, referring to the Irish question, and expresses the sentiment of the Canadian Parliament thereon, and the other re-affirms the sentiments contained in the resolutions passed in 1882. I consider that the amendment moved by the Minister of Inland Revenue embodies the ideas and sentiments and feelings of the great majority of the Irishmen of this Dominion, and because I believe so I will support that amendment.

Mr. O'BRIEN. It seems, Sir, to be assumed by all who have yet spoken on this question, that this House is unanimous in an expression of an opinion in favor of Homo Rule for Ireland, as embodied in the Bill brought in by Mr. Gladstone, or in some similar measure, as to pass in favor of that question by unanimous consent. Now, Sir, I, for one, view with the very gravest apprehension as to the result, not only to Ireland and the best interests of Ireland, but also to the Empire at large, of the measure introduced by Mr. Gladstone, and chiefly for this reason, that I do not believe any measure, which is the mere child of terror, forced on a man contrary to his convictions, contrary to the convictions of his own party and the nation at large, is likely to be attended with any great measure of success. Now, before proceeding further with that view of the question, I wish to claim the attention of the hon. mover of the first resolution, and I congratulate him upon this fact, that whatever the result of this motion may be, that hon. gentleman has shown that he has found one more point upon which he can stand and hold his party together, and carry them with him, in addition to the policy which was so fully developed the night before last, the policy of slander. On that occasion I noticed, whether from accident or design, he left the development of that policy to his able lieutenants, and certainly to one of them it was a congenial and suitable task. The hon. gentleman was not present to vote on that occasion. I can hardly suppose it was the result of design, but, at any rate, it had a singular appearance, when a proposition was laid before this House, a proposition which any member could hardly, in the abstract, have dissented from, that he was not present to take part in the discussion, a discussion, which, like everything else the hon. gentleman introduces, has succeeded by the personalities with which it was connected by the course of the debate which followed, landed him, as it always will land that hon. gentleman, so long as he pursues the policy—

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to order. I would ask whether this is an allusion to a past debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Well, then, I congratulate the hon. gentleman upon the position in which he stands, and upon his peculiar suitability for the position that he has taken as the mover of this resolution. I hope this remark may not be considered out of order. He poses—I withdraw that word, because it implies a charge of insincerity; but that hon. gentleman stands in the position, among laymen, of a declared supporter of evangelical protestantism in Ontario; and yet he comes forward as the champion of a measure which every Protestant in Ireland views as dangerous and perilous to his liberties.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Before I am done I will bring forward strong evidence on that point. The hon. gentleman, I say, stands in a peculiarly happy position as the mover of this resolution. It might be supposed that as a great lawyer, as a man who has gained his eminence in this country by his practice at the bar, and by his knowledge of constitutional law which is often boasted of, he would give some support to a measure which sets all law at defiance. There never was a system of coercion in Ireland to be compared with

the terrorism exercised by the Land League since Mr. Parnell was placed at the head of it; and it is somewhat singular that anyone can be found to support a body whose recognised agents have endeavored, and unfortunately too often successfully, to carry out their measures by the vilest crimes that any man can possibly conceive of. Hon. gentlemen will remember that upon this day four years ago, two men who landed in Ireland charged with a message of peace, which, if there had been time given to utter it, might have very much changed the position of affairs, but which they were not allowed to utter, were cut off by assassination. Now, I have a word to say to the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue. That hon. gentleman has spoken throughout this debate as though he alone had a right to speak on behalf of the Irish members of this House. I should like to have that hon. gentleman's definition of what an Irish member is. I should like to know who are the Irish members of this House. Are they those who, like himself, are of the Roman Catholic religion, and are also supporters of Home Rule?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman is laboring under a misapprehension as to the position I assumed in speaking on my own behalf as mover of the Irish resolution. I have assumed that position in face of the unanimous vote given in favor of that resolution; and, as I stated before, I do not believe that position is binding on anyone who dissents from the resolution which was then adopted.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I accept the hon. gentleman's explanation so far as it goes; but I desire to say this, that I utterly repudiate the idea that those gentlemen who support Mr. Parnell's doctrines as to what is best for the Government of Ireland, can be said to represent what is popularly called the Irish people, except so far as they speak for their own following in that country. I want that hon. gentleman to understand—and I think I am perfectly justified in making the remark—that there is a very large population in Ireland who have no sympathy with Mr. Parnell's doctrines or his movement, and who do not recognise him in any way as a leader. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether an Ulster Orangeman or a Protestant from the west of Ireland has not just as much right to speak in this House on behalf of that portion of the population of Ireland who are opposed to the principle of Home Rule, who look upon it as disastrous and perilous to their best interests, as anyone who believes in the position assumed by Mr. Parnell. Now, Sir, I, for one, occupy precisely the same position as the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue. I am the descendant of an Irish family, which at least has borne a not ignoble part in the history of that country; and I say, as representing that class of Irishmen, that I protest against any measure such as that introduced by Mr. Gladstone, which bristles with objectionable features, and which I think should be defeated on the ground that if it is passed something worse must follow. When the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue or other hon. gentlemen undertake to speak on behalf of the people of Ireland, I think it only fair to mention that at least one-third of the population of Ireland, including the great bulk of the Protestant population and a large minority of the Roman Catholics, who do not believe in the doctrines of Mr. Parnell, look on Mr. Gladstone's measure as disastrous to the country, and have protested and do protest in the strongest manner against it. They have taken very many occasions to express that opinion; and to show the depth of their feeling, I think I may be allowed to quote the remarks made by a member of the English House of Commons, whose name is historical, and who will, I think, be accepted as an authority on the subject. I allude to Mr. Plunkett, who, I think, is the member for the University of Dublin. At a public meeting recently held, that gentleman used the following language:—

"I wish I could realise for you the feelings of anxious grief, almost of despair, with which the loyalists of Ireland regard the present crisis. We foresee that our country, where we were born and bred, with which every hope and every affection and every tradition of our lives is bound up, will be committed to a condition of squalid poverty and violent social disorder which before long is almost certain to end in civil war."

These are serious words; they were uttered under a full sense of their importance, and I think they may be accepted as expressing the feeling of the minority of the people of Ireland towards the measure now before the Imperial House of Commons. But, Sir, the most serious objection to that measure, and the one which we, as Canadians, are most entitled to consider, apart from any sympathy which we may feel, as I do, with that Protestant minority, is that it is regarded by Mr. Parnell and his followers, whatever may be said to the contrary, as a mere lever by which they may accomplish what they really desire, that is, the complete isolation and independence of Ireland. In proof of that, I may cite no less an authority than Mr. Parnell himself, who, speaking at Cincinnati so long ago as 1880, said:

"None of us, whether in America or in Ireland, or wherever we may be, will be satisfied until we have destroyed the last link that keeps Ireland bound to England."

And that language has been repeated time and again. It was repeated only the other day by Mr. Davitt, one of Mr. Parnell's most trusted lieutenants, who, when asked if he approved of the Bill now before Parliament, replied: "When a man gets his breakfast, is it to be said that he should not get his dinner?"—meaning thus to illustrate his feeling towards that measure; and it is carried, even with modifications, can anyone believe that those who support it in Ireland would stop short of claiming absolute independence? Mr. Gladstone has put a weapon in their hands which I am sure they will not be slow to use. Why, did not that hon. gentleman say, when speaking of the laws made for Ireland: "Laws might be good in themselves, but not be accepted by the people because they came in a foreign garb." He there laid down the doctrine, from which I most decidedly dissent, that anything connected with England is foreign to Ireland. Now, what will be the necessary consequence, which will result from the absurd anomaly, looking at it from a constitutional point of view, no matter what one's politics may be, that taxation is to be unaccompanied by representation. The hon. gentleman proposes that the officials of what he himself said is a foreign country, shall hold possession of Ireland. If that is to be the case, how long will the Irish people consent to such foreign domination? I consider it a great misfortune that Mr. Gladstone should have used that word; but it is not a misfortune in the sense that the use of it gave the people of the Empire to understand what will be the necessary and inevitable results of the measure he has introduced. Not to be tedious, I will briefly refer to another objection, which, from an Irish point of view, is a most serious objection. I cannot understand how an Irishman, with any ambition beyond a mere provincial ambition, can give his consent to a measure which will degrade Ireland from the position of an integral part of the Empire to that of a mere Province. It was well put by Lord Clare, at the time of the union who though hon. gentlemen may criticise his conduct and say his opinion was of little value, was yet a man of surprising ability, whose opinions necessarily carried great weight, and who may fairly be given as an authority on this matter, when he asked: "What Irishman and what man who valued the independence and welfare of his country, would wish it to be degraded from the position of being an integral and governing part of the Empire to that of a mere mercenary Province?" That is precisely what Mr. Gladstone's Bill will do, and I am astonished any man of ambition should support a measure which will cut him off from all Imperial employment and Imperial honors. How could any

man in Ireland, no matter what his ability, expect promotion or employment in the Imperial service? How could he expect to be anything better than the official of a mere Provincial Government, when he had no longer a vote or representation in the conduct of the affairs of the Empire. It is a matter, not of congratulation, but of humiliation, to think that there should be a party in Ireland which will declare to the English people that they want to shut themselves out from the dignity and responsibility attached to their position as citizens of an integral part of the Empire at large, and become degraded to the position of mere provincialists. Take our Provinces. Is it not considered a higher position to have a seat in this House, to have something to say in the management of the affairs of the Dominion, than to have a seat in one of our Provincial Legislatures? Would any Irishman of ability be satisfied that he should be restricted to a mere provincial position? Would he not desire to be enabled to gratify his legitimate ambition for a share in the management of the Empire? Would he not consider it humiliating that it should be placed out of his power to take any part in the management of the Empire, and that his country should be reduced to the position of a large municipality? For these reasons, I am disinclined to say anything, which, however remotely, may tend to strengthen Mr. Gladstone in this measure. Mr. Gladstone made a very singular statement in his manifesto the other day. He said the opposition to Home Rule came from a single class. But do we not know well, does not every gentleman who takes an interest in public proceedings know, that the opposition to Home Rule is not confined to anyone class, is not confined to the hangers-on of anyone particular class, as Mr. Gladstone politely put it? Do we not find men like Mr. Goschen, Mr. Collins, Mr. Rylands, to say nothing of Mr. Chamberlain, Lord Hartington, Lord Derby, and Lord Salisbury, showing their faith in the true interests of the Empire? When we see leading Radicals casting their radicalism aside and standing forward as champions of Imperial interests, it is certainly time to give this matter more serious consideration. How many hon. members here who are prepared to vote on the resolution proposed really know anything or have read anything about Irish affairs? Have they considered the necessary consequences to Ireland which will result from the carrying out of this proposed measure? Have they ever considered what will be the position of what is called the minority, and what will be the effect, commercially, if this measure should pass? One of the great troubles of Ireland is that it is a poor country, but where has the money come from which has been employed in that country during the last century in the promotion of public works? It has come from England and it is to be supposed that if this measure should pass and a great shock be given to the constitution of the country—is it to be supposed that if the Government of Ireland should be handed over to the 86 men who follow Mr. Parnell, English capital will continue to flow into Ireland? It is more than likely on the contrary it will flow out. This is a consideration that ought to weigh with those who profess, and no doubt honestly feel, an interest in the welfare of Ireland. It is a consideration which ought to make us pause, and which is well worth the consideration of those who desire, however earnestly, Home Rule. I think that a measure forced upon a man against his convictions, because it is only a few months ago that Mr. Gladstone, speaking of Mr. Parnell, said he was marching through rapine to confiscation, can hardly be said to be an honest, well considered measure. The humiliation of the country, by reducing it from the position of an integral governing part of a great Empire to that of a province, is one that ought to come home to men like my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), who, if in Ireland, would hardly be satisfied to occupy the position of a mere provincial. I heard the hon. gentleman's eloquent speech which we all admire and few can imitate.

Mr. O'BRIEN.

and I ask if men like him in Ireland would not feel very cheap if their abilities had to be restricted to parish politics.

Mr. CURRAN. I am a Home Ruler to the mast head.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The hon. gentleman is no doubt patriotic, and may to some extent be self-sacrificing. What would be the effect on English politics had Home Rule been granted half a century ago? How many Irishmen whose names are illustrious in the annals of the Empire would have been heard of? How many noble and inglorious Miltons would have gone down to obscure graves? What would have become of Labor Shiel, Daniel O'Connell himself, Burke, Sheridan. Those men would have had no voice in the British Parliament, and would have been compelled, I will not say to waste their sweetness on the desert air, but to waste their eloquence on the quarrels of the small, miserable factions such as existed in Ireland before the union. What would have been the loss to the country had such a state of things been brought about? The commercial question alone is one of serious moment, because we cannot believe that, if the revolutionary measures proposed by Mr. Gladstone be carried, English capital will continue to flow into Ireland. Talk of the country not being prosperous; will anyone who has read about the conditions of Ireland half a century ago, and who has travelled through Ireland in those days, fail to recognise that it is a greatly improved country? There has, no doubt, been suffering there; so there has been everywhere else, but there has also been decided improvement in its condition. The people are not so poor, as many people would lead us to believe, great material progress has been made; and are we now to lose all chance of further progress? Are we to gratify the wishes of what I honestly believe to be nothing more than a faction, who have sincerity, no doubt, but are actuated by motives that fall short of anything like true patriotism. Holding these views, believing as I do that this measure is one that ought not to pass the Imperial Parliament, I raise my voice here in protest against it; and, as far as voting upon the resolutions now before the House is concerned, I shall vote for the amendment of Mr. Costigan, simply on this ground—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Hon. gentlemen may cheer, but let me finish my sentence—simply that it is just the one resolution of all the three that I think is likely to have the least effect.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I desire to address a few words to the House on this very important matter. The question of the government of Ireland is one that has engaged the attention of the greatest statesmen that have lived in Britain during the last half century. The minds of those statesmen have been engaged in striving to solve the problem for the better government of Ireland. It is well known that Ireland has been oppressed; it is well known that a system of landlordism has prevailed in Ireland that has disturbed the peace and marred the happiness and tranquillity that otherwise would have existed in Ireland. Various expedients have been thought of; various expedients have been devised with a view of ameliorating this condition and giving to Ireland control of her own affairs. Ireland has asked and sought for this, but she has always asked and sought in vain. A short time ago, you will remember that, when it was announced that that distinguished statesman who leads the Government of the British Empire, the Right Hon. William Ewart Gladstone, was about to propose a measure for the amelioration of this condition of affairs in Ireland, that he had a measure to propose that he thought would bring about peace, would relieve the distress, and stay the crime that had marked itself in Ireland for the past half century or more, the nations of the world stood as it were on tip-toe anxiously awaiting the utterances of that distinguished statesman. No

question introduced in the Parliament of Britain in the last century has moved the hearts of the people of the civilised world as much as that which has been proposed by the distinguished Premier of Britain; and when we read the oration which he delivered on that occasion, an oration which at once stamps him as a God-like man and a statesman without a peer in the civilised world to-day, the hearts of the people of Canada—not only the Irish hearts, but the Canadian hearts and the heart of every other true loyal Briton—went up in the refrain that Ireland might be reclaimed from the bondage under which she had suffered by the measures handed to the House by the distinguished Premier of Britain. And it is not to be wondered at. Ireland is great in many respects; she is renowned for her statesmen and her orators and her poets; she has a climate that is salubrious; she has vegetation that surpasses almost anything in the world, and the generous hearted people that inhabit Ireland have been oppressed and have sought for relief. Well, if they felt they were oppressed, had they not a right to say so, and, if they were misgoverned, had they not a right to amend this condition of things? Why, it is but the natural outcome, and crime is but the result of the misgovernment. It is not a trait of the Irish character, and the crimes that have been committed have not been committed by the Irish people themselves. They have been but a result of misgovernment and oppression. No wonder that there was a distinguished O'Connell a Burke, a Curran and a Grattan, who rose up; but it was the times, to a great extent, that made these men; it was the oppression that rankled in their hearts that led them to stand forth as the champions of liberty and of freedom, and their names to-day are dear to Irishmen, and to every lover of liberty to whatever nation he belongs. Well, the nations of the world were moved when it was announced that Gladstone was to speak, and we read that speech, a speech distinguished for its statesmanship and its brilliancy, a speech that was unequalled in the British House of Parliament, with a measure that was generous and just. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) seems to think that every condition in the measure proposed is vital and essential. The Premier says, with regard to the representation in the Imperial Parliament, that it is not a vital principle, it is liable to be amended, and all that the member for Muskoka has objected to in that respect—and that is the principal objection he used to the measure—is likely to be amended so that Irishmen will represent Ireland in the Imperial Parliament. The hearts of the Old Country people in this country and the hearts of the Canadians in this country go up in feid accord, a united people in this country outside of this House, in hoping that Gladstone may be sustained and that his arms may be strengthened so that he may be enabled to give to Ireland what she has asked for many years past. It is the desire of every patriotic man in this House that the wrongs under which Ireland has suffered shall be redressed, that the landlordism that has existed and that has oppressed the poor tenants in that country shall be done away with, that eviction and coercion of every kind shall be taken away from the law that governs Ireland, and Ireland shall yet be free, shall have her own Parliament, shall make her own laws, shall have her own Home Rule in effect. Well, this is natural, that we should sympathise with the distinguished statesman who has brought in this measure, a measure which, by reason of the traditions, by reason of those conditions that have existed in the hearts of other parts of the British Empire—traditions that have been formed, prejudices that have been grounded in the people—has met with much opposition; but it is the desire of true Canadians and true Britons that Ireland may receive that measure of justice which she has clamored for, which she has demanded, and which she has a right to expect. Are the Irish people, because they ask liberty, to be stamped out as rebels? Are

the Canadians who desire a change in our constitution to be said to be rebels? Are those who are now in this country seeking a change in our constitution and desiring Imperial Federation rebels? The First Minister himself is advocating radical changes in the constitution of this country, and for that is he a rebel? And is Mr. Gladstone, when he is redressing wrongs, stamping out injuries which have existed for centuries in Ireland, not deserving the support, the united support of this Parliament in the most important dependency of the British Empire, supposed to be represented by those who are true to the parent stem from whence we sprung? Now, Sir, in reference to the resolution introduced here some years ago, strongly as I felt that the wrong of Ireland should be redressed, I saw that there was no practicable measure before the Imperial Parliament, and I thought it was inexpedient to introduce the question here, it appeared to me to be devised for the purpose of securing popularity to those who introduced it. It would not look to be sincere and an honest thing. But to-day, when there is a practicable scheme, we see the author of the resolution in 1882 now shrinking from enforcing the principles he professes to admire. The member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) says he is a Home Ruler, and to-day he fears to urge this measure lest it might do some harm in one quarter or another. If the hon. gentleman was sincere in his efforts then for Home Rule and liberty to Ireland, he should be more so now, when there is a reasonable probability that the wrongs under which Ireland has labored so long are about to be redressed by the Liberal and enlightened measure of the distinguished statesman of Great Britain. When the leader of the Opposition introduced that measure he made a speech that will cause his name to live wherever the English language is spoken for all time to come. He based his speech on a broad and liberal platform, and it was characterised by that broad view which he brings to hear upon every question, and showed that he had made such an elaborate research into the affairs of Ireland, that it has endeared me to that hon. gentleman with stronger ties than ever I felt before. Well, Sir, the Minister of Inland Revenue was not in the Government then. He was then a humble follower, a private in the ranks. He introduced this resolution, and shortly afterwards, he entered the Government. Now, he thinks that all this should cease, that there is no necessity now for this House endeavoring to strengthen the hands of Mr. Gladstone and his Government, in the face of the opposition of the condition of Ireland, and that hon. gentleman moved the resolution. His utterances, to-day, give me an idea that he is not sincere, and that so soon as that gentleman got into office, so soon as the wrongs that had cried out for redress for a century, might continue to cry so long as that hon. gentleman enjoyed the spoils of office. Does it not look like that? So soon as he was transferred from the ranks into the Government, to use the words of one of Ireland's poets:

"He forgot the dust from whence he grew,
And thinks himself—the Lord knows who."

Now, that is the difference caused by the sweets of office, and it is a lamentable thing. I am glad the hon. gentleman is not entirely Irish. I would hate to see an Irishman give up the struggle for Ireland so long as a single wrong remained unredressed, and it is my great consolation to know that the Minister of Inland Revenue is not truly an Irishman, for otherwise he would not allow the charms of office, with the emoluments of office, to make him forget the wrongs that have cried out for redress so long. Now, Sir, Mr. Gladstone's scheme is capable of amendment. Mr. Gladstone indicates that it may be amended in committee, and

that the principle of representation without taxation shall not be maintained. There is not an hon. gentleman opposite who should oppose the measure upon that ground. They have taxed the people in the North-West from year to year without representation. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), opposes that. The hon. member supports a Government that allowed that condition of things to exist until it bred rebellion in that country, and still he had not a single word to say against the Government that permitted that system. And here he condemns Mr. Gladstone, who has since stated, and other distinguished members of his Government have stated, that modifications may be made in order to meet the wishes of the people of Great Britain and Ireland. Now, Sir, when a society sent a deputation to wait on the Minister of Inland Revenue, he told them that it would be injudicious to introduce this measure now.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No, I did not. If the hon. gentleman had been in the House he would have heard me correct that statement made by the newspapers. I made no such statement.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have just read it in the *Ottawa Citizen*, and that is the excuse given. I did not hear him deny that he had made that statement. Then if he had not this good excuse, in heaven's name, what excuse had he? What other excuse could he bring, when the wrongs of Ireland had gone on unredressed so long? If he had had the virtue of clinging to that excuse, I would have given him some credit, but now he has taken away all the merit he might have, and has no other reason to offer than the fact that he is now in office and that it might possibly hurt the Government if he went on with it. Then the Government are responsible for what he did. He thinks this is extraordinary statesmanship, endorsed, no doubt, by the Premier, and the Minister of Public Works who seconded his amendment. They sent a telegram to Mr. Parnell. Parnell is not introducing this measure. Why not send it to Mr. Gladstone? If they do not desire to give it a party significance, why not approach the foot of the Throne? If ever the First Minister grows eloquent it is when he talks about the "foot of the Throne." I wonder why he did not lay this grievance at the foot of the Throne. I think the member for Muskoka described Parnell as a robber, or something of that kind, and here we have the Government, through the Minister Inland Revenue, communicating with a gentleman whom the member for Muskoka dubs as a rebel, or something worse. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think all the lovers of freedom in this House will support the amendment to the amendment that has been moved by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen). I rather favor that. There is a word in the motion proposed by the leader of the Opposition which I would like to see left out. I will read the first sentence and point out the word, which I think might be left out because it gives it a narrowness which the motion ought not to have. I wish to see that one word "Irish" left out and "Her Majesty's subjects" inserted.

Mr. BLAKE. I would explain to the hon. gentleman that that word is in the original address, which I was following in that paragraph, and that is the reason it is there.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is the address passed in 1832?

Mr. BLAKE. Yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is quite satisfactory.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The explanation as given is somewhat satisfactory no doubt; but it is not quite satisfactory to my mind because it has a broader signification.

Mr. BLAKE. I quite agree.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And if there was an error at that time in the address I do not see why it should not be cor-

Mr. LANDERKIN.

rected now. With the motion of the leader of the Opposition I am heartily in accord. I am also heartily in accord with the amendment proposed by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). I cannot understand that any gentleman who professes to be Irish, or any gentleman who professes to be liberal, anyone who professes to be loyal to Britain and British institutions, would refuse to pass the address at this time, when a Home Rule measure has been so far successful that in all human probability it will carry, and will become the law that will govern Ireland; a measure calculated, we must all admit, when we read the speech of the distinguished Mr. Gladstone, to cause us to wonder that statesmen of Britain had not devised a plan before. We wonder that Ireland should have been left so long crying for redress of its grievances. Mr. Gladstone's measure appears so simple, so statesmanlike, so broad, so much in accordance with the principles of liberty, freedom and eternal justice, that we wonder it was deferred so long, that the problem of the proper government of Ireland had been left to be solved by Mr. Gladstone in the zenith of his power, of his years and of his greatness, and that it had been left to him to introduce a measure comprehensive, liberal and just, a measure calculated to right the wrong that had existed so long, calculated to remove those grievances that had goaded the Irish people so long, calculated to remove the system of landlordism that had ground down the people of that country into a state of almost abject slavery. Is such a measure of statesmanship to be ignored by this House? I hope for the honor of the Canadian people this House will not come to such a decision. I speak here as a Protestant, and speaking from that standpoint I believe it is necessary in the interests of all the people in this country, irrespective of religion, creed or nationality, to come forward at this moment and assist Mr. Gladstone, and do all they can to strengthen his hands so that his statesmanlike measure may be carried into effect.

Mr. ORTON. I desire, before recording my vote on this very important question, to make a few brief remarks. Unlike many of the hon. members who have preceded me, I have not the honor of being an Irishman or the descendant of an Irishman, but I happen to be an English Canadian. At the same time I have for many years been in favor of Home Rule for Ireland. As far as my humble ability would allow me to judge, I have always held that to grant Home Rule to Ireland would be the best means of strengthening the British Empire and causing Ireland to be like what we desire Canada to be, more closely allied to the British Crown and the fortunes of the British Empire. I believe Home Rule for Ireland would have the effect of strengthening rather than weakening the British Empire. But while I hold these views I do not consider the system of Home Rule about to be inaugurated by Mr. Gladstone, is one that is calculated to strengthen the British Empire; it is not one calculated to elevate Ireland to the extent that Home Rule should elevate that country and improve its condition. In the first place, the reason why I am opposed to the resolution of the leader of the Opposition is because it endorses the Home Rule principle laid down by Mr. Gladstone.

An hon. MEMBER. No, it does not.

Mr. ORTON. I say that is not calculated to do good to Ireland. The principle laid down in the Home Rule proposition of Mr. Gladstone is one simply of local government in minor particulars and on minor points. It is not proposed to give to Ireland the management of her own customs revenue or her own Excise revenue, and I hold that the only way in which Ireland can ever be largely benefited is by giving to that country the management of its own customs duties, so that it can encourage its own manufactures and furnish additional channels for the employment of the people. That, in my opinion, is the only possible way in

which a material improvement in the condition of the people can be brought about. One of the greatest causes of the misery and the unfortunate condition of affairs in Ireland to day is because the Irish people are nearly altogether an agricultural people. They have no possibility of successfully competing with the accumulated capital of England and other manufacturing countries unless the Irish people have complete control over the Customs duties; and unless this is secured they can never hope to have large manufacturing establishments in Ireland. It is for this reason I cannot agree with the resolution of the leader of the Opposition. I do not feel the same fear as do some of my Protestant friends that the Protestant minority in Ireland will be oppressed. It is possible that such might occur under certain conditions, and I think a scheme should have been devised so as to have specially guarded their interests; while I am afraid the scheme of Mr. Gladstone is one that is devised to give opportunity for the oppression of the Protestant minority. We have seen the same thing in our own country, and I would like to see extended to the Protestant minority in Ireland, the same principles that we extend to the Catholic minority in Ontario and the Dominion, and the same careful consideration of the minority as is conceded to the Protestant minority in the Province of Quebec. But that, in my opinion, is not provided for in the measure that has been submitted to the British House of Commons, and therefore I say that I cannot support the resolution of the leader of the Opposition, because it causes this House to accede to the principle laid down by Mr. Gladstone in his Home Rule resolutions, and those principles are not the principles which I would like to see carried out. I would like to see the people of Ireland more closely allied to the British Crown. I would like to see them have representation in the British House of Commons; I would like to see them partake in the expenditure for the peace and preservation of the British Empire; I would like to see them contribute, as no doubt they will be able to contribute, to the support of the British army and navy; and I would like to see Irishmen join with Scotchmen and Englishmen, and all the other peoples that constitute the Empire, in sharing the glories of the British arms in defending the rights of British subjects. For that reason it is most essential to the prosperity of Ireland, most essential to the unity of the Empire, that there should be Irish representation in the British House of Commons. It is utterly impossible, considering the position which Ireland occupies, in such close proximity to England and Scotland, that she should be separated in the manner in which Mr. Gladstone proposes to separate her from England and Scotland. Therefore, Sir, I shall not vote for the resolution of the hon. leader of the Opposition, and I say that the amendment moved by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is merely an addition to the resolution of his leader. It seems certainly a very singular position the hon. gentlemen occupy. First one hon. gentleman gets up and moves an amendment to his leader's resolution, and if that amendment means anything it means that he believes his leader is not in earnest, that he has not sufficiently strongly expressed his feelings in favor of Home Rule—the abstract principle of Home Rule—and he has moved this amendment to his leader's motion in order to make it more emphatic and perhaps more general in its character. Then again we find that another hon. gentleman on the same side has another objection. He objects to the expression of "His Majesty's Irish subjects," and wants to give it a still broader meaning. Therefore, I say, that the position they occupy is not a united one; it is not one which is calculated to carry with it that weight and strength that such a resolution should do in this House and I must say that the amendment made by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue is one we

could all unite upon. It does not express approval of the exact character of the Home Rule introduced by Mr. Gladstone, but it does approve of a form of Home Rule which will unite Ireland more permanently to the British Crown, which will unite instead of trying to dismember Ireland from the British Empire, and, therefore, I say, it is more thoroughly British in its character; it is more in the interests of Ireland, and it is more in accord with the sentiments and feelings of the vast majority of the people of this country, who desire to see Ireland enjoy the same liberty and freedom that we enjoy in Canada under the British flag.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not intend to occupy the attention of the House on this subject more than a very few moments. It is one with reference to which I should have liked to have addressed the House after having had some opportunity of considering what I was going to say about it. I think the magnitude of the question is such as to demand that it should be discussed with the best ability that all the members of this House are able, individually, to direct to it, and, therefore, I have no intention at the present time of attempting to make a speech on the subject. I wish, however, briefly to explain what my views are on this subject, how I shall vote, and why I shall vote as I do. Before doing so, however, I should like to congratulate the hon. gentleman, the leader of the Opposition, on at last having discovered a policy. I am sorry, however, that I cannot congratulate him on the nature of the policy he has discovered. That policy is a policy of discord. The hon. gentleman knows as well as he knows that a soul is in his body that the people of this country, the people of the Dominion of Canada, entertain views with reference to this question as wide as the poles asunder. The hon. gentleman knows that in his own city of Toronto, the other day a meeting was held, attended by some of the best informed and most influential men in Canada, and that at that meeting views were expressed diametrically opposed to the views that hon. gentleman presented to us to-day. He knows, too, that the sentiments to which I have referred are sentiments which may very readily be stirred deeply in the breasts of the people of this country. He knows also that this question has excited such an agitation in England as neither he nor I have seen before. He knows that England, that Great Britain and Ireland are divided into hostile camps on this subject. He knows very well that Great Britain and Ireland are in the throes of such an agitation as they have never seen before, in reference to this very question, and that an agitation so fierce is in progress there that actually the fearful and awful words "civil war" are whispered from lip to lip.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," but he knows that.

Mr. BLAKE. No, he does not.

Mr. McNEILL. Well, if he does not, he should read the newspapers or correspond with his friends in Ireland and he would know it. He knows that, and he knows how deeply that question may stir up feelings of animosity among men who are to-day neighbors and friends, and yet he has no hesitation in going out of his way to introduce this question and force it into the minds and hearts of the people of this country, irrespective altogether of the terrible results which may accrue. However, I do not mean to say the hon. gentleman is inconsistent, because we found the hon. gentleman the other day perfectly prepared to stir up, at all events, to side with a movement which most people in this country deem likely to introduce inter-provincial strife in this country, and it is perfectly consistent with such a policy that the hon. gentleman should introduce into Canada the question and press home to the minds and hearts of the people the question which he has now introduced. Neverthe-

less, I think the hon. gentleman will find that he has not succeeded in doing anything so very clever as probably he supposes he is doing. At any rate, he has done something dangerous in the hope of doing something clever. Sir, I say the hon. gentleman has gone out of his way to do this, because on the last occasion when this question was before this House, at a time when it was very differently viewed and regarded both in this country and in the mother country from the manner in which it is regarded to-day, the Government of Mr. Gladstone, by the mouth of his Colonial Secretary, informed us that it was not a question with which we ought to intermeddle at all. Yet notwithstanding that the hon. gentleman proposes that we shall open up this question.

Mr. MILLS. He has changed his mind and we haven't.

Mr. McNEILL. Yes, Gladstone has changed his mind; and just because he has changed his mind under certain circumstances, we are now, forsooth, to go to him and say to him: Will you kindly allow us to advise you now, because it suits you, while before you told us in cool blood that it was not a thing we should meddle with? Mr. Gladstone at that time was able to advise us on the subject in cold blood. He finds himself to-day in a very different position. He finds that in his attempt to introduce this question into the House of Commons, he has shattered his party in England; he has driven from his banner almost all the names that have shed lustre on the Liberal party of England during the latter part of this century. I ask, where is Mr. Bright to be found to-day? Where is Mr. Hartington? Where is Mr. Chamberlain? Where is Mr. Gladstone's late Attorney-General, Mr. James? Where is Mr. Dilke? Where is Mr. Goschen? Where is Mr. Gladstone's late Irish Secretary, Mr. Trevelyan? Where is that other Irish Secretary, that great man who up to the very last moment before his Imperial spirit fled, was found in opposition, as they all are, to this proposal of Mr. Gladstone? And because, forsooth, Mr. Gladstone finds himself in that position, and is glad to pick up any little crumbs of comfort that he can find here, there, and everywhere, we, the Canadian House of Commons, are to be asked to say to him: You would not accept our advice before—pray accept it to-day; and in order to place ourselves in that position, we have a question introduced which will sow discord throughout the length and breadth of Canada. But, for my part, I venture to say that I am as much entitled to speak here on behalf of Ireland as any man in this House. I am not only an Irishman by descent, but by birth; I spent my childhood, my boyhood, and a part of my manhood in Ireland; and I do not speak of this matter from the theory, but from actual knowledge. There is not any person inside or outside this House in Canada who loves Ireland more dearly than I do. My home was there, my father and mother are buried there, and I have dear relatives and friends there to-day. I claim to have as much right to speak on behalf of Ireland as any man in this House or this country, whoever he may call himself, and if I thought the measure introduced by Mr. Gladstone would be for the benefit of Ireland I would support it as heartily as anyone; but I do not support the hon. gentleman's resolution, because it practically supports that measure; it practically amounts to this, that if we pass it, we shall be endorsing Mr. Gladstone's action.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McNEILL. Hon. gentlemen know perfectly well that if that resolution is sent over, it will simply be used by Mr. Gladstone as an argument to strengthen his position.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McNEILL. I am glad to hear hon. gentlemen admit that. Now, what is that measure of Mr. Gladstone? It is not a measure which is calculated to settle the Irish

Mr. McNEILL.

question; it is not only very far from that, but if it is passed into law, we shall find that it will be only the beginning of trouble and discord in Ireland. It is not in any degree such a measure as this House expressed approval of in 1882; it is the very opposite. What was it that this House said in 1882? It was this, that if it was consistent with the safety of the Empire, and with the safe-guarding of the rights and privileges of the minority, some kind of Federal Home Rule would be advantageous for Ireland. Is it Federal Home Rule which is proposed now? It is the very opposite. So far from being a measure of a federal nature, a measure which would afford an opportunity to the different Provinces of Ireland to express their views and to pass their own laws, it is exactly similar to what a measure for legislative union would be in Canada. It is just as if we passed a measure preventing the people of the Province of Quebec from dealing with their own affairs. There exists in Ireland, as is very well known, a very curious parallel to the condition of things in this country. In the Province of Ulster in Ireland, there exists a condition of things very much like what we have in the Province of Quebec. The people of the Province of Ulster are dissimilar to a great extent in their sentiments and their religion from the bulk of the people of the other Provinces. Now, the measure proposed in this House in 1882 was a federal measure which would give those people an opportunity of safe-guarding their own interests as a separate Province. The measure the hon. gentleman is supporting is one of a perfectly different nature. It is one which will prevent those people from having any control over their own affairs, but which will put them under the heel of the people of the other three Provinces of Ireland. But, Sir, the measure proposed by Mr. Gladstone is a measure degrading to Ireland and the Irish people. It is a measure which deprives Ireland and the Irish people of any voice whatever in Imperial affairs. It reduces them to the rank of a mere Province, without the right to say one solitary word with reference to any Imperial question. But my main objection to the resolution the hon. gentleman has proposed is this, that the measure which Mr. Gladstone has introduced, so far from being the simple measure so eloquently described by the hon. member from Grey, is so complicated and so dangerous a measure that it has resulted in the disruption of Mr. Gladstone's own party, and has driven from his side many of his best and ablest supporters. Furthermore, if it should pass, it will simply enable those who desire to sever Ireland altogether from England, more strongly and more effectually to carry out their designs. I say that from my practical knowledge and experience of the feelings of many of the Irish people. I say it also because of the utterances of those who are called the Home Rulers in Ireland. I say it because of the mottoes which you find inscribed on banners and flags at Home Rule meetings. I say it because of the statements, more especially, that have fallen from the lips of the leader of the movement, Mr. Parnell himself, who stated, in Ireland, that he never would have taken off his coat to go to this work had it not been that by doing so he would be able to sever the last link that bound Ireland to England; and, moreover, because I know, from the expressions we have seen from time to time published in the press, that those are the views and sentiments of thousands in the United States who have lent to these people, not only the sinews of war in a monetary sense, but in another sense also. Therefore it is, that I cannot support the hon. gentleman's resolution, and that I shall feel obliged to support the amendment. I think the amendment of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) only makes the matter worse. I shall support the amendment of the Minister of Inland Revenue, because it expresses this view, that we do not ask the people of England to pass any measure of Home Rule for Ireland, of any kind or description, unless that measure

can be passed in such a way as to secure the unity of the Empire, and at the same time safeguard the rights and privileges of the minority of Ireland. There are very few Irishmen, in or out of Ireland, who would not be glad to have some measure or other of greater local self-government for Ireland than we have at present, but under the circumstances and for the reasons I have expressed, I shall vote against the resolution and in favor of the amendment as the better of the two.

Mr. HACKETT. Although the resolution before the House does not strictly affect Canadian interests, still I consider it my duty to make a few observations in regard to it. I believe Home Rule in Ireland would add to the strength of the Empire and unite the whole people of Great Britain and Ireland in one solid body. For this reason I support the principle of Home Rule. In 1832, when I had the honor of being a member of this House, a resolution was introduced by the Minister of Inland Revenue affirming the principle of Home Rule. An attempt is being made to make it appear that the hon. gentleman then was actuated not by motives of sincerity, but by personal motives, in order to gain popularity with a certain class. Being fully cognizant of the facts connected with the introduction of those resolutions, I can speak with authority and I say that the hon. gentleman was not actuated by mercenary motives but by the high motives of patriotism. He believed that at that time, when Mr. Parnell and his small band of Home Rulers were struggling for Home Rule in Ireland, it was particularly becoming, in fact it was the duty of the Canadian Parliament, to move a resolution in favor of Home Rule, thereby encouraging Mr. Parnell in the noble fight he was making and strengthening his hands at every critical moment. That resolution passed unanimously, and was forwarded to Her Majesty. What was the answer of Mr. Gladstone? He said: Mind your own business; we are willing to take your advice on all matters connected with Canada, but on all Imperial affairs we can only consult the Imperial authority. He did not receive our address graciously, but now, owing to the skilful manner in which the agitation for Home Rule has been conducted by Mr. Parnell and his coadjutors, Mr. Gladstone is forced, by political exigencies, and not because of any strong feeling on his part for the Irish people, to introduce his measure. He has introduced it, mainly because he believed that Mr. Parnell would eventually force Home Rule on the Parliament of Britain, and that it was necessary to anticipate such an event. Believing that the resolution in 1832 was sent at a time when it would do the most benefit, I arrived at the conclusion, on consultation with other gentlemen of Irish extraction in this Parliament, that we should restore our record on that. We had there before the British Government the resolution of 1832, showing that the people of Canada were strongly in favor of Home Rule, and as no action has been taken since then, as our resolution has remained uncontradicted, we consider it was in the interests of Ireland that no resolution should now be introduced, which would not meet with unanimous support, as, instead of strengthening Mr. Gladstone's hands, such resolution would have a depressing effect. It was rather astonishing to find, the other evening, that the leader of the Opposition had introduced his motion as an amendment to go into Supply, and then compared his resolution with that of 1832. I maintain there is no comparison whatever. The Minister of Inland Revenue gave full notice of his resolution.

Mr. MILLS. No.

Mr. HACKETT. The notice was considered sufficient.

Mr. MILLS. No, it was changed and another motion brought in.

Mr. HACKETT. Well, the motion affirmed the principle of Home Rule, and hon. gentlemen were fully aware it

would be brought. It was found that owing to the business of the Session, it would be impossible to reach the motion in due course, and the right hon. the leader of the Government consented to allow the hon. gentleman to move it in amendment to Supply; but the leader of the Opposition introduced his resolution without giving notice. No hon. gentleman on this side had any intimation that the resolution would be introduced, but the hon. gentlemen asked: Why did not we consult with the Irish members of the Opposition. My experience of those gentlemen would not lead me to consult them on a matter of this kind. In 1832, when the Minister of Inland Revenue, in his zeal for the Irish cause, invited leading gentlemen on that side to meet him and discuss the matter, a meeting was held at which it was decided to appoint a committee composed of hon. gentlemen on both sides who would wait on the right hon. the leader of the Government and the hon. the leader of the Opposition, and endeavor to obtain their support to a resolution in favor of Home Rule. To our great surprise, when the committee was named, a prominent gentleman on that side, Mr. Anglin, who was placed on the committee said: I will have nothing further to do with you, and walked out of the room. That was the way a leading Irishman, who should have taken an active part in introducing the measure, acted. After being appointed to the committee to wait upon the leader of both great parties, the hon. gentleman would not consent to anything of the kind, and walked out of the room, leaving there gentlemen of less experience, and ability to endeavor, as best they could, to carry through this important resolution. Therefore I say the experience we had on that occasion would not lead us again to consult those hon. gentlemen on matters of so important a character. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) said the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue should have spoken now, that he should not have spoken before. Of course in that he was only repeating what was said by his leader. I say the time the resolution was sent over in 1832 was the most important time, that now when the victory is almost won, now at the very threshold of success, after they have been battling and contending with the great powers they had to contend against in Ireland, those gentlemen who have succeeded in obtaining this for Ireland, though we should congratulate them upon their great success, still 1832 was the time when they needed help and not now when they have almost obtained victory. Therefore, though the hon. gentleman is quite correct in that statement, that those resolutions may have a good effect, and may in some way strengthen the hands of Mr. Gladstone, the time to fight for liberty is not after the fetters have been struck off the feet of the slave; it is not then that you are to come forward to support him; the time to support him is when he is down, when he is struggling for liberty, and not when he has obtained it. The hon. gentlemen in opposition, pretend now to be very strongly in favor of Home Rule for Ireland; but during the five years they were in power what was done? Did they introduce a resolution in favor of Home Rule? Was not this question as important then as it is now? Did not Parnell in 1876, and Biggar, and those men who were contending with him at that time, and Mr. Butt, who was then the leader of the Home Rule movement, want that moral support from the people of Canada, and the whole world, that Gladstone wants now? Yes, they did. Those were the dark days, when every man in Ireland was struggling against the greatest odds. Those were the days when some support should have been given to them by the people of Canada. But during the five years that they were in power there was not one word about Home Rule; not one word in the Parliament of Canada to encourage those brave men who were fighting for Home Rule. But now they are boiling over with enthusiasm in favor of Home Rule, they are bursting with their fervor for

Home Rule, after they see that Parnell and the men who co-operated with him have almost achieved success, when a measure has been introduced into the Imperial Parliament which will probably be carried through, although in its present shape it is not such a measure as I would care to see; because, I think, if the Irish people are not represented at Westminster, they are deprived of their representation in matters of great importance affecting their interests; and I hope to see before the Bill becomes law that it will be amended in that respect. I do not know that I need continue this subject further than to pass a remark on what was said by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). He spoke with great warmth, and I have no doubt with great sincerity. He said that no Protestant in Ireland was actually in favor of Home Rule. He must have read history astray. Is not Mr. Parnell a Protestant, as good a Protestant probably as the hon. member? Is he not the apostle of Home Rule in Ireland at this time? Is not Mr. Justin McCarthy a Protestant, and are not others of those who are battling for Home Rule in Ireland at this time, and fighting the battle with such great success, Protestants? They are Protestants, and it is for that reason that Irish Catholics should stand by them. There is, of course, a very respectable minority in Ireland opposed to Home Rule, but it is hoped and believed that this measure will afford to these people the same protection in their rights and privileges as is afforded to the minority in Quebec and to the minority in Ontario. It is a part of our Federal Government that could be very fairly put in force, and, with these amendments, I am sure that those people in the north of Ireland who are now opposed to Home Rule will be reconciled to it and will see eventually that Mr. Parnell and those sincere Protestants who work with him are patriots as well, and are working in the interests of the whole country. But, after the snub we received in sending home the address of 1882, I think it would be quite improper again to send an address of a similar character. I think we should do as they did in the Parliament of Quebec, simply pass a resolution affirming the principle of Home Rule. They are proposing to pursue a similar course in the Legislature of Nova Scotia, and, in view of that fact, I support the resolution of the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue in amendment to the main motion of the hon. the leader of the Opposition. I believe that resolution is more in accordance with the genius and spirit and the dignity of the people of Canada and that, after being treated in the insolent manner in which we were treated in 1882 after the passage of that address here and after having it sent to Her Majesty and after having received the very insolent reply from Lord Kimberley, we should not allow ourselves again perhaps to be treated in a similar way. I therefore support the motion of the Minister of Inland Revenue, as it affirms the principle of Home Rule as fully as the resolutions of 1882, which have been quoted so approvingly by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. ALLEN. I desire to say a few words on this important subject before the vote is taken, being an Irishman by birth, having lived in that country for nineteen years, knowing that oppression reigns in that country, knowing and believing by past experience that that country has been badly managed, that there have been grievances for the past five hundred years, that no statesman for the past two hundred years has been able to grapple with the affairs of that country. To-day we find that there is such a gentleman who will stand up in the House of Parliament in England and advocate the rights of Ireland and the rights of Irishmen, while many in this country and in other countries deny the fact that Irishmen are competent or deserving to govern themselves. It is a slander which we do not deserve. Irishmen are able to take their position in all British dependencies in any part of the world. They are competent and able to take a position on every

Mr. HACKETT.

platform. We find them so in every department, I learned with a great deal of satisfaction and pleasure, a few weeks ago, that the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) has prepared a resolution on this very subject. I was very much disappointed when I heard afterwards that for some reason he had abandoned the idea. Later, I heard with pleasure that a deputation from an Irish society waited on the Minister of Inland Revenue and that he was about to bring forward a resolution to the same effect. But, Sir, I was the more disappointed when I learned that he refused to bring forward this motion, which was similar to the one brought forward by him in 1882. The grievances of that lovely and down-trodden country are in the ears and in the mouths of all countries around us. We know there are grievances there. If there had not been grievances in that country, it would be to-day the most lovely, fertile and happy country in the world. While we here enjoy Home Rule to our heart's content, are we willing to sit down and say that our mother country shall not enjoy the same privilege? We have a population of not quite 5,000,000 inhabitants, and we find that Ireland contains 5,300,000. I hold in my hand a report of the last general election in Ireland, and I find in my native country, which has sent Conservative members to the English Parliament, probably for 30 years out of 40, in the north riding of that county, the Nationalist candidate received 5,268 votes, while the Conservative candidate, one of the most popular gentlemen in the county, received only 772. In the south division of the county of Sligo, of which I am a native, the Nationalist received 4,610, while the Conservative received only 541. This is in the north-west part of Ireland. But I will refer to the northern counties of Ireland. I find in the county of Cavan, one of the Protestant counties of Ireland, that in the east division the Nationalist candidate was returned unopposed. In the west division the Nationalist received 6,425 votes, while the Conservative received only 1,779. In the county of Donegal the Nationalist received 4,597, while the Loyalist received only 952. In the east division of the same county, the Nationalist received 4,089, while the Liberal candidate received only 2,992. In the west division of the same county the Nationalist was returned unopposed. In the south division the Nationalist received 5,505, and the Loyalist, 1,379. In the county of Down, one of the most populous Protestant counties in Ireland, in the north division the Conservative received 4,315, and the Liberal 2,841. The most strongly Protestant county in Ireland is that wherein Belfast is situated. We find there that although the Protestants predominate, the Conservative majority was very small. We find that Mr. Johnston was the only gentleman in all Ireland who really received a large majority. He received 3,610, while the Liberal received only 990, and the Conservative, 871. Now, if we turn from these to other counties, we find that in the county of Londonderry, another Protestant county, the Conservative only received 5,180 votes, while the Liberal received 3,017. In the south division a Nationalist was elected. In the county of Derry a Conservative was elected by 1,824 votes, and the Nationalist received 1,792. In the county of Tyrone a Conservative was elected in the north division. If we turn to the south of Ireland, we find that in the county of Cork, the Nationalist received 5,033, and the Unionist 106. But there are even larger majorities than that. We find in one county that 4,953 votes were given to the Nationalist, while the Conservative received only 75. Now, Sir, in a county of 5,300,000, where they give such a decided expression of a desire to govern themselves electing eighty-four Nationalists to seventeen Conservatives, where there has been such dissatisfaction with the Government of England, are they not entitled to some consideration under a constitutional government? Look at the results of the Government in past years. At the time of the disestablish-

ment of the English Church in Ireland, the excitement was almost as great as it is now. It was stated then that the country was going to ruin, that it would bring separation from England and destroy harmony between Ireland and England. But I am glad to state on the best authority that the English Church in Ireland has never been so prosperous at it has been since it has been self-sustaining;—and I believe self government in Ireland in local matters will remove agitation and unite bonds of friendship which has not existed the past century. Sir, are we afraid or ashamed to stand up for our rights and again ask Her Majesty to consider a resolution from this House? Is it true that we have been insulted? Why, Sir, we are entitled to our rights as British subjects, we are entitled to our privileges as an independent people, and I say we should stand up for the same rights which we asked for in 1832, and again give our advice to the Home Government to take into consideration the question of justice to that country which we love so much. I hope this House will support unanimously the resolution as submitted, and I, for one, will support the resolution as submitted, or the amendment of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen).

Mr. WALLACE (York). I desire to make a few remarks on the resolution before the House. Two days ago, the hon. member for West Durham sprung a resolution upon the House. He had evidently not sufficient time to prepare his resolution with sufficient care, because we find that he has had to avail himself of the literary abilities of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) to assist him in perfecting his resolution. Sir, I do not think that the resolution proposed by the hon. member for West Durham will meet with the approval of this House, because it asks this House to affirm the principle of Mr. Gladstone's Bill giving a measure of Home Rule to Ireland. There are many people who will favor Home Rule if it is a fair and equitable measure, but who oppose the scheme of Mr. Gladstone because of its gross injustice, and the manifest failure that will attend it if it should become law. For myself, I can say that if Home Rule in Ireland means such home rule as we have in Canada, if it means those rights of local government which we find so beneficial in our own country, I favor such a measure of Home Rule. But if Home Rule in Ireland means, as many people believe it does, the dismemberment of the Empire, then Canada will be strongly opposed to such a measure. Mr. Parnell, who is at the head of the Home Rule party, is a man with great rectitude of purpose; he states his desires and wishes pretty plainly, and in his course he has not deviated very much from his first purpose. And what does he tell us? In a speech delivered by him at Cincinnati, on 23rd February, 1880, on the Irish question, he said:

"None of us, whether in America or in Ireland, or wherever we may be, will be satisfied until we have destroyed the last link which keeps Ireland bound to England."

That was the policy which Mr. Parnell in 1880 enunciated when addressing the people of Cincinnati. We find Mr. Parnell's course and policy since then have not varied. What was his policy then is evidently his policy to-day. I am afraid the measure proposed by Mr. Gladstone, which is supposed to be for the better government of Ireland will have the effect of carrying out Mr. Parnell's policy, for we find when we examine Mr. Gladstone's Bill, which we are asked by the resolution proposed by the leader of the Opposition to sanction and afford our moral support, indicates this. What do we find in the Bill? Mr. Davitt was asked:

"Whether Irishmen would be satisfied with these arrangements, and whether they would accept them as a permanent settlement of the question. He said that was as unreasonable as to ask him after he had had his breakfast to refrain from demanding his dinner and his supper. Sympathize with Mr. Davitt, but do not be led astray!"

If Mr. Gladstone's measure becomes the law of the British Empire, then we will find in case of war that Ireland will

have no interest in it, that the people will not have to pay a cent of money to defray the expenses, that they will have no voice in saying whether there should be war or peace, and that they would not be compelled to contribute their quota of men and means, and therefore Ireland would have no interest in the struggles which Great Britain may have for her very existence. What do we find further? That the foreign and colonial policy of the British Government will have no interest for the people of Ireland. No portion of the British Empire has done more to build up our foreign and colonial possessions than has the Irish race. No portion of the British Empire has contributed braver soldiers to assist in fighting the battles of Great Britain than has Ireland; yet, if this measure becomes law Irishmen will have no chance of obtaining position or promotion in the British forces, because by the law Ireland will not be called upon to take part in the defence of the British Empire, and instead of the people being active in assisting to maintain the supremacy of the British Empire, they may be found on the other side, because, having no direct and pecuniary interest in the result of the conflict, other circumstances may prevail which might cause them to take the other side. We find still further in Mr. Gladstone's Bill, which the member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) asks us to approve, that while the whole control of Excise and Customs is taken from Ireland and centred in Great Britain, not an Irish member will be a representative in the Imperial Parliament at Westminster. The Parliament at Westminster will make many of the laws for Ireland, impose the taxes for revenue and do many other acts, but yet she will not have a voice at Westminster. How long will Ireland tolerate such a gross injustice? That one thing in itself contains the elements of dissolution of the union between Great Britain and Ireland, and the elements of discord which will sever the Empire if Mr. Gladstone's measure becomes law. But though we may in the abstract pass resolutions that we think may be of benefit to Ireland, yet the Irish people themselves are the best judges of their own position. What do we find? A large portion of the Irish people, 25 per cent. of the whole, and, practically, the whole Protestants of Ireland are bitterly opposed to Mr. Gladstone's scheme, while the Home Rulers themselves have not expressed approval, but have taken it, as Mr. Davitt says, as an instalment of what is to come. The Protestants, I repeat, have, with great unanimity, expressed their opposition to Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule scheme. I have here the words of a distinguished English statesman, one of the leading members of the Liberal party, and one who cannot support Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule scheme. He says:

"We have been accustomed, perhaps a little too much, to talk of Ireland as if it were one people. There are two nations in Ireland (hear, hear), two communities separated by religion, by race, by politics, by social conditions. There are in Ireland at this moment something like one and a quarter millions of Protestants, most of them in the province of Ulster, a great number in Dublin, and others scattered up and down the country in little groups everywhere, working out their existence by becoming the centre of honest, praiseworthy industry and enterprise (cheers). This minority—it is not a small one (hear, hear), it is one quarter of the whole population—through good repute and evil repute has been loyal to the British connection (cheers) and it has been industrious and it has been prosperous. They are bitterly opposed to this scheme, rightly or wrongly. Under the protection of the British Government they have lived on terms of amity with their Roman Catholic neighbors. They believe that their property, their religion, and all their lives, could not safely be trusted to a Nationalist Parliament in Dublin (cheers). For my part, I hate coercion, and I am not disposed to coerce these men by British soldiers (hear, hear and cheers). I am not prepared to disregard altogether their wishes (hear, hear and cheers). I think that they are entitled to some consideration from the British power that they have hitherto uniformly supported (hear, hear). We are asked now to pledge the credit of the British nation to the extent as I shall show you directly, of 160 millions (hear, hear) for the benefit of the Irish landlords (oh, and shame) who, as Mr. Gladstone has shown himself in the speech which he made in introducing the Land Purchase Bill, have not always had a blameless record in the past. We are told that this enormous liability is a duty laid upon us by the misdeeds of our ancestors—that is, an obligation of honor ("Not at all") but that there is no obligation of honor to that great Protestant minority

of one and a half millions who, at all events in recent times, have never committed any act of oppression, who have never lent their lives to violence or disorder (cheers), whose patient industry has co-ordinated more to the prosperity of Ireland than all the agitators that ever lived (loud cheers), and who even now are giving in the shape of taxation, in the shape of enterprise in the shape of all that can come from enlightened citizenship as much as all the rest of the population put together."

That may be accepted as a correct statement of the case, and when we find that a large portion of the Irish people, the most enterprising and wealthy are directly opposed to Home Rule, when their interests are not considered in the scheme proposed by Mr. Gladstone, I think we should be chary, we should be very careful how we recommend motions of which we do not know the purport. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) on a recent occasion could not proceed with a resolution, could not take any action in a certain case which came before the House, because he had not sufficient papers. He was living in this country, was cognizant from day to day of the case as it progressed; he knew all the circumstances of it, but in consequence of a greater number of papers not being forthcoming he could not pronounce judgment. But in this most intricate question, one involving great issues, one involving the prosperity of a great country—because Ireland is a great country—he can make up his mind almost in a moment's notice and put resolutions on the paper endorsing the scheme which has had to face the opposition of Mr. Gladstone's own political party. It looks to me—perhaps I am wrong—a good deal like toadying to Mr. Gladstone. There is one other matter to which I shall refer, which has already been referred to by the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton), and that is the fact that in these resolutions of Mr. Gladstone, the Customs and Excise, the power of putting on taxation, the power of protecting the industries of the country, is not given to Ireland, but is retained by England. Well, I had occasion a few years ago, when this question was up for consideration, to make some remarks, and I then said, and I repeat now, that I think the principal case of Ireland's want of prosperity is the fact that they have no protection for the industries of the people. Mr. Speaker, no country ever became great or prosperous or wealthy without manufactures. There is no instance of a people becoming wealthy through agriculture alone. There are more people in Ireland than could cultivate perhaps twice as much ground as they have here, and in order that the people should have sufficient employment there must be manufactures in that country. They have very few manufactures there to-day, and those are mostly in the north of Ireland where we find the people most prosperous. What Ireland requires to-day to ensure her prosperity and give employment to her people, to make them prosperous, contented and satisfied is protection, and the encouragement to build up the manufacturing industries in their midst; and while these are lacking I venture to predict that Ireland will not have a career of great prosperity. I am sorry that, with all Mr. Gladstone's ability, he has been unable, and perhaps unwilling, to formulate a scheme by which manufactures might be encouraged in Ireland; because I am convinced, as I said before, that Ireland will never become a great, prosperous and contented people until employment is given to her population, until they have various manufactures in their country, and employment is given by manufactures as well as by agriculture to the people of that great country.

Mr. BLAKE. If the question of the fittest motion to be made, of what motion is to be made which would get the greatest measure of support in this House and yet accomplish the greatest measure of assistance for Ireland, is to be solved now, on the floor of this House by discussion between hon. members and by expressions of opinion on the different forms of motion, that responsibility does not lie at my door, because when I was in a position in which I was

Mr. WALLACE (York).

able to obtain the decision of the House upon the precise proposition which I thought moderate and yet the best calculated to produce that result, I abandoned that position upon the statement of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue that, to take the other attitude and withdraw my motion and to accept the right of bringing forward my views in this form, might produce a result, after conference, of agreement. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue in inviting me to accede to the suggestion of the First Minister said:

"Therefore I think the hon. gentleman should withdraw it. Then there would be an opportunity given to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, who, he thinks, have been lax in their duty, to consult with him. We do not claim that anything we may say will influence his views; we do not pretend to hope that; but I think we are entitled to say to him that, feeling as much interest as he possibly can in this question, it might be possible for us to agree upon a motion that would be passed unanimously by the House. We might possibly agree upon a motion to be submitted to the House and passed unanimously, and I am sure the hon. gentleman will agree with me that such a motion would be of more value than one which necessitated a division. I am not here to discuss what changes we might ask for; that could be discussed among those specially interested, and to whom the matter might be referred. If the hon. gentleman thinks that would at all meet his views, and that he can't come to such an understanding, I will not continue my remarks; but if he thinks my request is one he cannot entertain, I will have to crave the indulgence of the House while I make further remarks on this subject."

I rose and, after making an observation or two, on other things, said:

"I may at once say that I am quite willing that whatever time is reasonable and consistent with the object of the resolution should be given at once to carry out the suggestion of those hon. gentlemen. My object is just what the hon. gentleman's is, to produce a unanimous motion; and because he tells me expects, by the course he proposes, to produce such a result, I am all the more ready to agree to that course."

At a subsequent part I said:

"In the meantime, as to the form in which the motion shall be presented, I shall only be too glad to meet the hon. gentleman, or any other hon. member, with the view of settling that point."

At a subsequent period, after recess, the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue said:

"Whether the suggestion comes from one side of the House or the other, there are grounds, perhaps, upon which we can unite, and the suggestion that we should agree upon a resolution, is worthy of fair consideration."

"Hear, hear," said I. The hon. gentleman proceeded to say:

"And I think that the hon. gentleman who refuses that must assume considerable responsibility, if the vote is not as large as it might be made by a fair discussion of our views on the subject."

"Hear, hear," I said assentingly to that remark. Then, when the final arrangement was made, my last words were these:

"And I add to that, in response to the statement of the Minister of Inland Revenue, and to the suggestion rather than the statement of the First Minister, that if there be any opportunity in the meantime to accommodate matters with reference to the form of expression of that motion, I shall be only too glad to facilitate such a happy result."

Then the Minister of Inland Revenue said:

"Whatever difference of opinion may exist between the hon. gentleman and myself, I feel much pleased that he has taken this course, as I think it is the wisest course and one calculated to bring about, if possible, a solution of this question. I am glad the hon. gentleman has taken the course he has."

Now my motion was before the hon. gentleman; he had stated his desire to consult with me; he had stated his desire to make such suggestions as he hoped after conference might produce an agreement. I at once responded, twice and thrice responded, declaring that I would be most happy to concur in the steps he proposed to take, with a view to our arriving at that result. But the hon. gentleman, as I was obliged to say in offering my motion to-day—neither he nor any hon. gentleman intimated to me the slightest dissatisfaction with the form of my motion. He made no suggestion or proposition for a change; he invited me to no conference on the subject from the time the discussion closed down to this moment. Therefore, I say, if it be on the floor of this House, by hon. gentleman bringing forward his proposition in opposition to mine, if it be on

the floor of this House that we have to dispose of the question of which is the fitter resolution, which is the more appropriate, the responsibility of that result, whatever may be the measure of it, lies not at my door. Now, Sir, the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue explained the reasons why he had not acted; and he took occasion to say that one of those reasons was not what had been stated erroneously in one of the papers to be the case, a danger that the resolution would be defeated? Not at all; he never apprehended that; but a danger that there would be three or four dissentients. That was what the hon. gentleman said, that was the measure of the danger which prevented him from bringing up this question in this House. Now, Sir, we know from the proceedings which took place very shortly after the passage of the address in 1882, that there were three gentlemen who stood up and announced that they dissented on that occasion; though neither you nor I, as I had occasion to say at that time, had seen any expression or dissent. There was therefore a public avowal of dissent on that occasion. What the hon. gentleman has now declared is that after considering the whole situation, after analysing the feeling of the House, so far as he could judge it, and anxious as he was to go forward after ascertaining what the feeling was, he believed that there might be three or four dissentients out of the 211 members of this House; and that circumstance affrayed him from the enterprise. Well, we are glad to know that. In whatever quarter the hon. gentleman apprehended those three or four dissentients resided, it was not on this side, for he asked none of us our opinion on the subject; and we have tolerably well learned already, in the course of this debate, where it was the hon. gentleman knew that the dissent existed. We have heard it from the outspoken utterances of some; we have heard it from the House of hon. gentleman's own friends; and because there were three or four of his own supporters who disapproved of the measure, he chose—and that is his defence to the people of Canada—he chose to determine that no resolution ought to be moved here. But the hon. gentleman said: There is another reason; it is a useless thing to do in view of the circumstances of the former address, as well as a dangerous thing, because the new work could not be so thoroughly accomplished as the old. It was useless, although this was a new House; useless, although the conditions had changed so much between that time and this. I believe the feeling in Canada has changed; but my belief is that there has been a growing feeling in favor of Home Rule in Canada, and that feeling is very much stronger to-day than it was in 1882; and certainly that is not a change which should affright us who favor Home Rule from endeavoring to obtain the views of the representatives of the people on the subject. But there is another circumstance. The time is critical. Read the cabled reports in the newspapers of the impressions of the leading organs of public opinion and of those who take most interest in following public measures, and you find it impossible to say what the fate of the principle of Home Rule—because that is what Mr. Gladstone says he holds to be at stake on the second reading of the Bill—is to be; and Sir, if there was no reason why some further action should not be taken to-day by those who acted before. I want to know why the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue telegraphed to Mr. Parnell that he and the Irish members of this House still abided by that address. He gave Mr. Parnell that encouraging and flattering assurance, that assurance so calculated to cheer and elevate his mind, that the Irish Catholic members were really still true to Home Rule. What was the inference to be drawn from that message? Why, the inference was that of the other members he could not say the same. What other inference could you draw? He says to Mr. Parnell that the Irish

members, by which I understand him to mean the Irish members of his own creed—nay, those of them who sit on his own side of the House—are of the same opinion as before. He treats it as an Irish Catholic question, as the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) treated it—

Mr. CURRAN. I beg your pardon, Sir. I did not do anything of the kind.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; and so treating it, they got together a body of gentlemen from the Senate and the House of Commons who are Irish Catholics—no, not the Irish Catholics, but the Tory Irish Catholics. Did the hon. gentleman invite Senator Power to that meeting? Did he invite Senator Scott? Were they there? Did they take part in it? No; the Irish Tory Catholic clique meet together, in a little assembly, and they say, this is so purely an Irish Catholic question that we alone are to decide whether a resolution is safe or prudent or advantageous to be introduced into the House. Sir, if there be a step which is calculated to prejudice the cause of Home Rule at home or abroad, so far as we can do it, it is its treatment of it by hon. gentlemen in the hon. gentleman's position as an Irish Catholic question—as if it was not a general question which all lovers of liberty throughout the world have an equal interest in.

Mr. HESSON. Where are the Irish Catholics on your side?

Mr. BLAKE. I have mentioned two Irish Catholics on my side of politics, members of Parliament, whom the hon. gentleman did not consult.

Mr. HESSON. Not members of this House.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not say members of this House; I said members of Parliament. Now, Sir, I ask what inference could be drawn from the state of things which I have referred to. In 1882 an address passed unanimously by the Commons of Canada in favor of Home Rule. In 1885, the question in a critical condition, in which the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue feels it necessary that something should be said on behalf of some portion of the Commons of Canada on the subject to show that they are still true to the views they formerly expressed, and his utterance on behalf of the Irish members of the Parliament of Canada. Now, there is the contrast that would be drawn. The enemies of the cause would say: Ob. In 1882, the Canadian Parliament, unanimously in the Commons and by a very large majority in the Senate, passed resolutions in favor of Home Rule. In 1886 a Minister of the Crown is afraid to move a resolution in favor of Home Rule, and he sends forwards, forthwith, his own cable despatch to Mr. Parnell, which is to be taken as equivalent to the voice of the Commons of Canada. No, it could not be equivalent. Is it a substitute? No, but it is a declaration by inference, that the other members of this House, and those for whom the hon. gentleman, by what authority I do not pretend to say, chose to speak, would not say what he said. I ask, did he apply to any of them to allow him to speak for a larger constituency than those for whom he spoke? If he did, what answer did he get which discouraged him from speaking for more? That is the position in which the hon. gentleman's action put the question, so that the enemies of Home Rule could say: Canada will no longer speak in favor of that measure, and the best proof of that is, that the Minister who moved the resolution in 1882, does not move another resolution to-day, and does not profess to aver that the Canadian Parliament believes as it did then. Now we know the reason. The hon. gentleman stated it would be a dangerous thing to move again, because there would be some dissent, although he limits the dissentients to three or four. Again, the hon. gentleman says: "Oh, then, there is the difficulty about the form of another

address which deterred me"; but still that does not appear to be a very serious difficulty, because the hon. gentleman has found another form which gets rid of that difficulty to-night, so that that could not have prevented him from earlier action, unless his wit has been spurred by the exigencies of the last day or two, and his zeal for the Irish cause was not sufficiently potent to enable him to find out what, under the spur of necessity, which we all know is a powerful lever, he has since ascertained. He has proposed a method of getting over the difficulty. But circumstances now differ. We are not now doing what Lord Kimberley, unadvisedly, in my opinion, told us in effect we ought not to do; we are not now tendering advice to Her Majesty's Ministers as to the policy they ought to accomplish; but we propose to cheer and encourage them on in the course they have declared they will pursue. We are not offering advice, but we are adding the moral force and support of this House to them, to aid them in the course they are themselves pursuing.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I hope it won't.

Mr. BLAKE. Ah! there is one of the dissentients.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I have always been one.

Mr. BLAKE. I will have to settle an account with these three or four who have deterred the Minister of Inland Revenue, up to this day, from bringing forward his resolution. I say we were right in 1882, in averring that the Commons of Canada had the right, and that it was our duty respectfully to address our Queen, the Queen of the Empire, tendering our loyal suggestions and opinions upon the question so interesting and important to us, as citizens of the Empire and as Canadians. I hope no hon. member of this House will declare to-day that we were not right in doing that, because, forsooth, a Colonial Secretary has been found to express a different opinion; I hope we are not going to abnegate that right as citizens of the Empire; I hope we are not going to derogate from that right as citizens of the Empire. I say our most dignified course is to pass on, and when the occasion again arises, as it is now arising, in which not under similar circumstances, because, as I have said, we are not now tendering advice but are still expressing the opinion in which, with reference to the same matter, we are fortunately able to say we abide by the views we expressed in 1882, which you did not think fit to adopt then but have since adopted and are now carrying out—I say no more fortunate occasion could be conjectured for this country to re-assert with dignity its right to address the Queen on this important subject, with the certainty that the right this time will not be repudiated but be gratefully acknowledged. The most dignified course for us is to re-assert in that way, not by any reference to Earl Kimberley, our right to speak to our Queen, to signify to her our views on this question, the occasion, as it is now admitted, calling for it. The hon. gentleman himself proposes we should signify our opinions, although in an abortive fashion; and proposing that we should signify our opinions, and I say the most dignified and the happiest method is simply to go forward and once again, in a constitutional manner—unless we are prepared to rescind our address, unless we are prepared to agree that we should do so no more—re-assert our sentiments, with such variations as the circumstances of the case may require. But if we do not choose to proceed by an address on this particular occasion—and that because we have been told formerly that we ought not to proceed by address to advise or suggest—I hope that we shall not fall so low as formally to record on our journals the agreement that we ought not to act for that reason. If the hon. gentleman's amendment is passed, we shall agree that, because Earl Kimberley chose to make this statement four years ago, therefore we do not choose to address the Queen; and that

Mr. BLAKE.

of course will apply to all cases of emergencies in which Imperial interests may be concerned. We will be agreeing and in a formal manner assenting to the view of Earl Kimberley; we will be acting upon that view, we will be declaring he is right and we are wrong, and in thus agreeing we will close the door upon ourselves by our own resolution, from, at any future time, venturing a humble address to the Queen upon an Imperial question. Sir, there are, no doubt, exciting times for the British Empire; there may be troublous, dangerous times for the British Empire, and I shall never willingly agree to abandon the right of a British subject or of the House of Commons of any colony to approach the Queen and to tender her respectfully the advice and opinions of her subjects in foreign parts upon those questions which touch the interests of the Empire, which so nearly concern us, although we are not able to speak directly by representation in the British House of Commons. I now turn to the substance of the hon. gentleman's resolution. It is a suspicious circumstance, it is a circumstance which ought to make the hon. gentleman himself suspicious of his resolution, that it finds so much favor with the enemies of Home Rule. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), with that frankness which commends itself so much to the confidence of this House, told us in the concluding, the most pungent, and, he will allow me to say, the most forcible phrase of his speech, that he would vote for the amendment of the Minister of Inland Revenue because it would do the least harm. Let me make an appropriate alteration in that phrase, if we are to put it in the mouth of a friend of Home Rule; and we would say: We would vote for either of the two other resolutions because they would do more good to the cause than the resolution of the Minister of Inland Revenue. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), is loyal to his party, and so he proposes to vote for the resolution of a Minister of the Government he follows, which resolution he does not approve. It is a harmful resolution, but even that one, colorless as it is, pallid as it is, as hedged around as it is, built up as it is to satisfy, as far as possible, the susceptibilities of the hon. member for Muskoka, he is prepared to take, but to take only because it does the least harm. The hon. gentleman has presented to him three different kinds of nauseous drings. He smells at them, he sips them a little, he puts them up between him and the light, he puts down two and with a wry face he swallows the third. It these are the sentiments of the enemies of Home Rule held up to these different resolutions, what should be the sentiments of the friends of Home Rule? I am very sorry, for the cause of Home Rule, that the Minister of Inland Revenue, in the attempt to please his three or four dissentients, in the attempt not to wound their susceptibilities, should have proposed a resolution, which, by comparison, will be certainly less favorable than I should have desired, which will provoke unfavorable comparisons just where we want favorable comparisons to be put. I am very sorry that, in the attempt to combine the heterogeneous substances of which the hon. gentleman's following is composed, he should have given us a resolution which has produced these comments from the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), and practically, though in more veiled language, from other hon. members of his way of thinking. Now the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran), after having made a speech which I do not think really was very likely to conduce to harmony and good feeling—perhaps it was the hon. gentleman's mode of producing harmony; perhaps, an Irishman like myself, he thinks a good light is the way to promote harmony and good feeling—uttered a fervent expression of trust that the proceedings might end harmoniously. After all our heads are broken, I suppose we are all to shake hands. And the hon. gentleman proceeded to apply his blackthorn to my unlucky pate, and to smash me as fast

as he could. Well, I am glad to know, that the hon. gentleman's arm is not quite long enough to reach me, and that I do not feel much the worse for the exhibition of prowess which he displayed on this occasion. He says that there are grounds for suspecting me. He will not suspect me; oh no, not he; but it makes a great draft on what he calls his credulity not to suspect me; and he proceeds, with the precision of a criminal lawyer, trying to make out a case in a police court, to give the grounds upon which I am to be suspected, which grounds are not sufficient, with his candor and kindness and good feeling, to induce him actually to suspect me; but it is about as hard for the hon. gentleman not to suspect me as it is for the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) to swallow the resolution. He says the first ground is this: There were other Irishmen in the House, and did I consult them? Now, for a long time these hon. gentlemen, having their little cliques together, got talking over this matter, trying to decide what should be done. I ask, did they consult me? Had I not helped them before? Had I not done my best to forward this cause? Had I not done my best to produce a happy result on the former occasion? And, if there was a question to be considered on this occasion, might I not fairly have expected that before they reached a decision upon it they might have consulted me? I do not complain of their not consulting me unless they chose. I do not take the line of the hon. member for Montreal, but if it is a ground of complaint against me that I did not consult them after they had decided that it was too dangerous to move in the matter—though where the bomb shells are to come from they know, not I; where the mines are to be exploded they know, not I—I should like to know with what reason they can complain of my not consulting them. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue was good enough to consult me on a former occasion, in a sense. He referred to it, though with an inaccurate recollection of the circumstances, the other night. He did not bring me to the committee. I suppose it is to be pardoned to him as to me, the making of these little slips, but he gave a new nationality to one hon. member. He said they had decided to bring all the Irishmen in the House to the committee except the First Minister and the leader of the Opposition. I know that seven cities claim the hon. gentleman for a birthplace. Sometimes we hear that he was born in Scotland, and sometimes in Canada.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the hon. gentleman will allow me for a moment, I will say that he is correct in regard to what I stated. I remember that I committed that error in the words I used. What I intended to say was that we did not think it advisable at that time to invite any of the leaders of the House, and his being the leader of the Opposition was the reason why he was not invited.

Mr. BLAKE. I thought the hon. gentleman, with his superabundant loyalty to his chief, which he has exhibited on several occasions and notably on one occasion, in order to keep up that harmony on which they lay so much stress, was desirous to strengthen his hold on the people of this country by declaring him an Irishman for the occasion, but he now tells me that it was one of those blinders that he and I as Irishmen are privileged to make. I say the hon. gentleman was good enough, after having settled the form of this motion, to send it to me with a note to which I responded in general terms, but in the motion which the hon. gentleman brought forward I saw another hand. He knows who drew it. It was his brother Irishman. It is quite true he did not consult him early, but he consulted him late. He brought him into committee, and, when the fatal blow was to be struck, when the hon. gentleman was at one bound to fix himself on the pinnacle as the representative of Irish sentiment in Canada, it was his brother Irishman, the First Minister who helped him. This is

the first reason why the prosecutor here proposes to show that there are strong grounds, which only his great sense of generosity can induce him to say are inadequate, for suspecting me—that I did not consult him. The next is, that the resolution was brought in as an amendment to Committee of Supply. A dreadful sin; because I followed strictly the precedent of the last occasion, when the resolution was brought in as an amendment to Committee of Supply; because in 1883 it was brought in as an amendment to Committee of Supply, and in 1886 I proposed it in the same way, because the First Minister, when in Opposition, had brought up the constitutional question of the Letellier case, not at all impugning the Government at the time, but simply bringing up the question, whether Lieutenant-Governor Letellier had acted constitutionally in dismissing his Ministers, brought it up as a non-party question stated so distinctly, because I thought these two precedents were ample justification, and served as a good reason for me to propose this resolution in amendment to Committee of Supply—particularly as there was no other way of getting it at all; because I knew that hon. gentlemen thought it was too dangerous to touch, and of course would not help me to touch it; that they thought it ought not to be brought up, and of course would not give me facilities for bringing it up; and therefore, but for my bringing it up in that way, we would not have not have had it at all—because I did not perform impossibilities, only his great sense of generosity can lead him to consider the reasons inadequate for not suspecting me. Then he says that perhaps I ought not to have spoken to him, but at any rate I ought to have spoken to the Minister of Public Works, the leader of the French Conservative party, it was my business to have spoken to him, and because I did not the hon. gentleman feels grievously inclined, but for that superabundant good nature of his, to suspect me. Well, I have often had occasion to consult the Minister of Public Works, during the unfortunate absence of the First Minister, on the ordinary routine of public business and so forth, and our relations are always, I am happy to say, very pleasant; but what particular reason there was for consulting with the Minister of Public Works on this question I do not know. I suppose that the decision of the Minister of Inland Revenue and his friends was not taken without consulting with his colleagues and the Minister of Public Works. We knew that all these gentlemen had decided that it was too dangerous to bring this question up. Well, then, the hon. gentleman says: Oh, but the *Globe* said some time ago—I do not know when the *Globe* pointed out that I was in a minority, and I could not bring a resolution up; and because the *Globe* expressed an opinion, which I heard of for the first time, I must confess—for I am not so diligent a reader of my *Globe* as the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Carran) is of his—and I say, because the *Globe* expressed the opinion a fortnight ago, that being leader of the minority, I could not bring up this resolution, the hon. gentleman finds another ground which, to less credulous persons, would be a good ground for suspecting me. Then he goes further. He says that the Ottawa correspondent of the Montreal *Post* said that such a resolution, if moved here by the Conservatives, would be a Tory dodge, because the Ottawa correspondent of the Montreal *Post*—I have no doubt a very respectable gentleman, but whose acquaintance I have not the honor of having—said that the resolution moved by the Tories in this House upon this question, would be a Tory dodge, and therefore I am to be suspected if anybody but the hon. member for Montreal Centre brings up the resolution. Well, under these circumstances it is that I am a suspected character, and that I presume, under the old coercion Act, I would have been liable to go to Kilmainham. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that there should be no address, that, it is contrary to the feelings of

the Irish people—by which, I presume, he meant the Irish Catholic people—that we should address the Crown again upon this subject. I think the hon. gentleman mistook the feeling of the Irish people, whether Catholic or Protestant, I do not believe it. I think he is entirely mistaken. I should be very sorry to suppose that there was any reluctance on their part to the Commons of Canada submitting to the Queen of the Empire their opinions on this subject; and all I can say about that is that he and I are at issue there. The hon. gentleman states that he consulted a great many persons—of course on his side of the House; and he was told there would be a very great difficulty indeed in proceeding, because of the answer to the last address—very great difficulty. I daresay that the friends of the hon. gentleman who don't want Home Rule, did magnify the difficulties, and pointed out to him that the snub, as it is called, of Earl Kimberley, was a reason why this great step, in which he and I are so much interested, should not be taken by the Commons. Allow me to advise the hon. gentleman in the future, when he is trying to find out whether there are difficulties, rather to distrust the opinion of those who don't want the step taken. You know of the timorous man who finds a lion in his path. The hon. gentleman has found a good many lions in his path, I do not know whether they are coloured orange or tawny, or what, but to my mind it looks very like—for I do not share the hon. gentleman's generous feelings in a desire not to suspect—it looks uncommonly to my mind, considering the quarters in which he searched, as if he was in search of lions, as if he wanted some good cause to be afraid, as if he wanted to find a reason for not doing anything; and he went about among the alarmists and the alarmists alarmed him, and, being properly alarmed, he held his tongue. Then he says, the address may be regarded as a satire upon Earl Kimberley. Earl Kimberley is a very respectable personage, but I am sure he would have too much good sense to suppose that was a satire upon him. But these hon. gentlemen who think that we have been snubbed by Earl Kimberley's answer, I suppose, would not be very loath to reassert our rights and our dignity by addressing the Throne, even if it did happen to be a little satirical upon Earl Kimberley. I suppose it would not grieve their souls very much that we should be able to say: We were right then, and we saw a little further into the future than you did, and we now help you on to do that thing which, four years ago, we exhorted you to do. I do not think the hon. gentleman's pack of alarmists would, from that point of view, have great difficulty in supporting the address. Well, then, there were some other hon. gentlemen who referred to me—for, really, I have had so much attention paid to me to-night that I feel embarrassed properly to respond to the compliments I have received—there were some other hon. members to some of whose remarks I shall not pay any attention, but to one or two I shall. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) said that I had said that I had acted spontaneously. Was I not asked to move? he said; was I not forced forward? Sir, I have frankly stated that I waited until the last moment in the hope that some of the opposite side of the House would move. I felt satisfied that their apprehensions could not be from my side, that they could not fear any opposition from me, knowing what I have done in 1874, and I hoped that they would be able so to compose the differences in their own ranks, so to create a unity of feeling on that side of the House, that, knowing that the solid Liberal force would be with them, they would not be afraid of their own friends, so far as not propose a resolution. I had hoped that happy result would ensue; I did hope we would find the Conservative party a unit with the Reform party in favor of this, and I waited until the last moment, in order not in the slightest degree to embarrass the efforts which I felt sure—and I now find was right—that the Minister of Inland Revenue and the

hon. member for Montreal were making, in order to achieve that happy result. It seems they failed to promote a unanimity of feeling amongst their friends, and that, therefore, they gave up the attempt. It was not until then, and until the question was, as I said the other day, almost at the door that I moved. Now, with reference to my being asked to move. I was not asked to move until I had made up my mind that I was going to move, and when I was asked to move, I will tell the hon. gentleman the response which I made to those who asked me. I was asked by a deputation from a very respectable society here, the St. Patrick's Literary Society of Ottawa, and I told the gentlemen who were good enough to wait upon me that, highly as I felt the honor of the invitation, I could not accept any invitation from any body, speaking for any particular sect, or class, or nationality in this community, either to act or to abstain from acting, upon a question of this description. I said I believed that the question itself would be injured if it were treated from any such point of view, as the special property of one portion of the community. I said that it was as Canadians, as persons interested, from their experience of its blessings, in the principle of Home Rule and its extension, as Canadians, citizens and subjects of the Empire, interested in the prosperity of England, as free men, interested in the propagation of the cause of freedom, that I could act, and that I thought the strength and force of any such movement would be greatly diminished, and that prejudices would be excited which ought not to be excited, if it were attempted to be moved from one particular section of the population, or by any man as the exponent of one portion of the population. I decline altogether to agree to the position which some hon. gentlemen opposite arrogate to themselves in regard to this question. The Irish Catholic members in this House and in the other Chamber have no special part in this question—none whatever, and their cause suffers when they attempt to assume such a position. It is as Canadians they are to speak; it is as one of a body; and, with the exception of three or four individuals who have frightened the Minister of Inland Revenue, it is as Canadians speaking in favor of a common cause, moved by a common impulse and acting on a common impulse, we are to succeed, and they who make difficulties in the cause are they who declare that this question is the special part and property of a particular class of the people. Then the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) said that I was trying to catch the Irish vote. I have been in public life a good many years. The Irish population of my Province is, of course, the Irish Protestant population and the Irish Catholic population. I have endeavored to do my duty and to act upon what I believe were sound liberal principles towards all classes of the population. I have found myself opposed by a solid body of the great majority of the vast bulk of the Irish Protestants of Ontario. They are my strongest and earnest and fiercest political opponents to-day. I have found myself opposed by the great bulk of the Irish Catholics of Ontario. They also have been amongst my opponents when I was defeated in South Bruce, during my absence from the country through ill-health, it was the Irish Catholics of that riding that rejected me, that deprived me of my seat in Parliament and obliged me to run in another constituency at a subsequent date. I have endeavored, notwithstanding that, to do my duty and to act according to my lights honestly, justly and fairly towards the Irish Catholics and towards the Irish Protestants, towards all classes. I make no distinction whatever in consequence of class or creed, and I extend no bid for the support of any class or creed. The position of the Irish Catholics and the Irish Protestants is this: They know that from the Liberal party they will obtain all they can justly claim whether they give or refuse the support. They know that the Liberal party will act on the principles

MR. BLAKE,

of justice, freedom and of liberty, because that is the plank upon which they stand. They know they have nothing whatever to gain by supporting us, because they will not gain one jot or tittle beyond what those principles of justice, freedom and liberty require. They know they have nothing to lose by opposing us, because they know, however strenuous their opposition may be, it will not make us one whit less earnest or less active in the promotion of their interests and the common interests according to the same principles of justice, liberty and freedom. And therefore there is no need for them to turn their votes one way or the other in order that they may obtain from the Liberal party their meed of justice and liberty. That is our relation to that class, and to which the hon. gentleman rather coarsely said I was attempting to catch their votes. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), who is an old personal friend of mine, and who I am sure must have been very much excited to-night when he used his blackthorn against me as well as the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) used some expressions in regard to a former debate, for which he was called to order and to which I will not refer. He said I occupied a very peculiar position because I happened to be—he misstated my position—the leader of a party in religion. I am none such. I am certainly of the evangelical portion of the denomination to which I belong, and I am a member of the advanced wing perhaps of that party. That is quite true. And the hon. gentleman says because I was a Protestant occupying that position I know, if I had any Protestant friends in Ireland, that every Protestant in Ireland denounced Mr. Gladstone's measure. I have some Protestant friends in Ireland and I have some in Canada, and the bulk of my Protestant friends in Ireland, and it is perfectly natural considering their condition, circumstances and surroundings, are opposed to Home Rule. But I deny altogether the statement that every Protestant in Ireland denounces Home Rule. It is not so. The hon. gentleman will remember that there are a very considerable number of persons who are for self-government for Ireland. And it is not to be forgotten that such was the sentiment of the country at the very time at which union took place, which is now thought such a sacred compact—that compact which was begotten in prodigality and corruption admittedly without a parallel, that compact which was certainly not a holy compact—it was opposed as strongly and earnestly by the large body of Protestants, ay by Orangemen too, as by the other classes of the population. Then the hon. gentleman said—and I quite approve of his observation, and I made one like it myself—that he claimed the right to speak for Ireland as well as the Minister of Inland Revenue. He is perfectly right. I quite accord the right to speak for Ireland to the hon. member for Muskoka; let each speak according to his lights. He thinks Home Rule will be disadvantageous to the country from which his people came, and I think it is an advantageous proposal for the country from which my people came. We are each of us I suppose entitled to our own views and are free to follow our own convictions. I quite agree that the hon. gentleman has as good a right to speak for Ireland as any other hon. member whose ancestors came from Ireland, and in each case it must depend upon the circumstances under which, and the degree of interest and thoroughness with which the hon. gentleman has studied the question, and after all any definite conclusion at which any of us may arrive may be erroneous. The member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) said he also had something to say about it. He endorsed the principle of Home Rule, but he found words to say that he would support the Ministry. I do not think it takes very much to induce the member for Centre Wellington to support the Administration. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) said that I knew there was a great diversity of opinion in Ontario. I have no

doubt there is a considerable number of persons absolutely, though a very small number relatively, I believe, in the Province who entertain strong opinions adverse to Home Rule; but I believe that the vast majority of the people of that Province, taken as a whole, are directly, thoroughly and irreconcilably in favor of the principles of Home Rule as applied to Ireland. That is my opinion; I may be mistaken; the member for North Bruce may be right if he entertains a different opinion, but such at all events is my opinion. Then the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) said that the motion would not do because it endorses the measure of Mr. Gladstone. What my motion does is to endorse the principle of that measure, which principle, as I pointed out to the House on Tuesday, the author of the Bill himself declares to be the principle of Local Government or autonomy for Ireland. The question of Irish representation for Imperial purposes at Westminster, he said, I put to one side; I do not ask you to vote for that on the second reading. There are other details in regard to internal matters, and in regard to them Mr. Gladstone says, I do not ask you to vote for them; but I ask you to vote for the second reading of the Bill to vote for the principle of self-government for Ireland and for this measure calculated at all events as far as the Local Government of Ireland is concerned, irrespective of the question of the measure of control it should have in Imperial Affairs, to form a basis for settlement. What the hon. gentleman says is that measure will not do. It does not suit his views. He is opposed to any large measure of Home Rule. He would like the Irish to have municipal institutions, but a large measure of Home Rule he is opposed to, and therefore he is opposed to my motion. That is the reason I want my motion carried because I am in favor of a large measure of Home Rule. He is opposed to my measure because it will aid, comfort and support the second reading of Mr. Gladstone's Bill, which he does not want. But that is just what I do want—that the second reading of that Bill should be carried. I believe that the most important stage in the question of Home Rule for Ireland would be achieved by the second reading of that Bill. I do not believe the question will be ultimately settled in the terms of that Bill, but the most important stage in the settlement of it will have been passed if it is carried, and if it fails I do not choose to forecast the consequences. But I do say that the very reason which the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) who, with those other gentlemen, are, I suppose, the dissentients, to whom the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue referred—the very reason he gives as a reason why the motion of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue is preferable to the motion which I have offered—that they are prepared to support it, because it would do so little good and that it would do less harm than the other, is the reason why I say my motion should receive the support of the House. Then the hon. gentleman says the question is a most intricate one. Undoubtedly, it is a vast question, an enormously intricate question in its details; and if we were offering an opinion on all its details I think we would require a great deal more study and perhaps a great deal more local knowledge, as to some of them, than we have had the opportunity of acquiring. But we are not asked to pronounce on the details of the measure. We are asked, as I have said and as I have established, to pronounce on the second reading of Mr. Gladstone's Bill, as an affirmation of the principle of Home Rule to Ireland. That is the best, the most sensible, the most practical step towards the accomplishment of the object which I believe a majority of this House has at heart, and that step we are asked not to take, that step we are asked to set aside in favor of this pale, this colorless resolution of the Minister of Inland Revenue, which is acceptable to hon. gentlemen who do not like Home Rule, because it is the less calculated to promote Home Rule. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) said it really looked to him as if I

were toadying to Mr. Gladstone. Because I had not moved an address directly to Mr. Gladstone, because I had not asked the House to express its sympathy and admiration for Mr. Gladstone, as has been done by other bodies, because I preferred passing him by moving for an address to our Most Gracious Sovereign, I was supposed to be toadying to Mr. Gladstone. When in 1882 I ventured to point out the difficulties of Mr. Gladstone's attitude at that time, when I pointed out that he has, since proved true by his action, that it was not a sufficient defence for him to say that a small minority which had grievances did not formulate a plan which they had no power to carry into effect; that if he admitted that there existed grievances, it was his duty, who had the power, to formulate the best plan he could in order to remedy admitted grievances according to his lights. The First Minister said: Here is a gentleman criticising that great statesman, Mr. Gladstone, criticising him aye sely, using harsh language towards him, telling him that he is mistaken, that he is wrong, that he ought to do some other thing. Mr. Gladstone, he said, though a great statesman, like other men, is human, and he will be annoyed when he sees the hon. gentleman's speech. I hope, he said, that the *Hazard* containing his speech will be delayed in transmission; I hope that by some happy accident the mail steamer may be lost, so that the hon. gentleman's speech may not reach him, because, if it does, the good which the address will do will be defeated by what he has said of Mr. Gladstone. Yet the hon. member for West York finds to-day that I am toadying to Mr. Gladstone. Now, Sir, I believe it is extremely unfortunate that the proposal of the Minister of Inland Revenue as to an effort to agree upon the motion, in the interval between Tuesday and to-day, were not by him carried out. I think it would have been much better if that had been done; but we have now to settle the question in the ordinary way. I consider my motion preferable to the hon. gentleman's for the reason I have stated. I consider the amendment which the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMillen) is proposing to introduce to it an improvement on my motion. I intend, therefore, to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Wellington.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is only one reason, why I feel justified in trespassing on the indulgence of the House after the long debate we have had, and especially after the exceedingly able speech to which we have just listened, and that is the reason that I am one of the few members of the present Cabinet who have not had previously to-day an opportunity of expressing an opinion on this question. I am one of the members of the party now in power who sympathise with the resolutions and the address which this House adopted in 1882, although I had not then the honor of a seat in this House. I sympathised with those resolutions and with that address for reasons which I propose to state to this House in a very few words, and they are the reasons which induced the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), to impugn the wisdom, the policy and the good faith of those resolutions and of that address. The hon. member for South Grey in the observation which he addressed to the House a few moments ago, intimated that those resolutions and that address in 1882 were exceedingly ill-timed. He told the House that at that time there was no practical measure before the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and that our words would have very little significance and very little effect. Now, Sir, the circumstances in which the Irish question stood in 1882 were, the circumstances which induced me to feel proud, as one having some Irish blood in his veins, of the action taken by the hon. gentleman who now occupies the position of Minister of Inland Revenue, and to feel to some extent proud of the action of this House. The circumstances, and the position of the Irish question in 1882 were such that the voice of friends, and courageous

friends was called for. The people of Ireland in 1882, and especially the men who spoke for her, were men who had few friends in the British Empire, few friends in Parliament, and they were men who could feel that the voice of encouragement coming from fellow-subjects on this side of the ocean would bring to them sentiments of friendship and elements of strength which they greatly needed. The Irish people, or that very large section of them, at any rate, who had been struggling for Home Rule and the amelioration of the land laws, were then, in prison, and this Parliament was one of the first, on this side of the Atlantic, if not the only Parliament within the British Empire, that raised a voice, not only to assist the struggling powers, but raised a voice on behalf of the men who were then in Kilmainham prison. Let me ask this House who were the friends of liberty and freedom, who are so boastfully declaring this evening that only within their ranks are true liberals to be found—where they were when those sentiments were pressed on this House, and why it was, when they were in Opposition then, as they are now, they did not meet in caucus and put forth their leader to ask the House to proclaim that the sentiments of liberty and freedom they are so proud to advance to-night should then be advanced in favor of men who had few friends, men who were actually immured in dungeons in Ireland, in 1882. These were the very reasons which induced the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) to say that the resolution and the address then were ill-timed. These were the very reasons which led me to believe, as one having some sympathy with the cause in favor of which that address was sent forward, that the voice of this Parliament was a timely voice. The position in which that cause stands to-day is very different. It is the hour of success, notwithstanding that some hon. members on this side of the House doubt the immediate and perhaps the eventual success of the cause in favor of which this struggle has taken place. This much at least has been achieved, that the principle of some liberal measure of Home Rule for Ireland has received far wider acceptance in the United Kingdom than could possibly have been anticipated in 1882. The friends of that cause, instead of being imprisoned, are, leading a most influential party holding the balance of power in the British Parliament; and it is only on an occasion when the cause may be said to have triumphed—when at any rate it has advanced so far that the success of such a measure, consistent with the safety of the Empire and the rights of all classes, is assured—then it is that those friends of freedom, who combine with their own ranks and caucus only sentiments of liberty, are willing to come forward and ask this House to adopt resolutions in sympathy with the cause which has achieved such triumph. Now, a reason given why the House should adopt this resolution is that it is the right of the House, in spite of the rebuke of the Earl of Kimberley to assert its undoubted privilege of addressing the Throne. Let me call the attention of the House to the fact that this has been altogether renounced in the resolution now offered to this House and in the speech of the hon. member for West Durham. That resolution and that speech assert no right. They simply express joy at the action of Mr. Gladstone in introducing the Home Rule measure; and the hon. member for West Durham says: We are not approaching the Throne as we did before, we are not tendering advice to Her Majesty, or Her Majesty's advisors; we are cheering them on. Sir, the House in 1882, on motion of my friend the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue did cheer on a depressed, a downcast cause; and I, humbly think, it is beneath the dignity of this House, as I feel sure it is beneath the dignity of gentleman expressing such a large love of liberty, to say that this action is taken only to cheer on the Imperial Government, sustained by a powerful Parliament, in bringing forward a measure which has obtained so thorough an adhesion, and the success of which is really assured.

Mr. BLAKE.

if not as to its details, at any rate as to a very large measure of the principle involved. Now, instead of Mr. Gladstone's position and his attitude towards the Irish members having been in 182 what it is now? I hold under my hand a speech delivered by him not more than four months before that resolution and address were adopted by this House, in which he declared that the policy of Mr. Parnell and his Irish followers, which had been put forth by their friends as one of the points of Irish patriotism, was simply the gospel of plunder. I think it more consistent with love of liberty, love of civil liberty, and love of personal liberty, that then the voice of this Parliament should be raised, as my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue asked Parliament to raise it, than it is to raise it in the hour of comparative success. Now, Sir, the hon. member for West Durham let fall one remark in support of his contention that we are 'not sacrificing' our dignity, which fell somewhat strangely on my ears. One of the reasons he has just advanced why this House should again approach the Throne, or rather Her Majesty's Ministers, with an address expressing joy for what they have done, is that the action of Lord Kimberley in 1882 was unadvised. The impression made on the minds of some of the members of this House by the tone of the reply sent to this Parliament was that Lord Kimberley alone was responsible for it. Let me call the attention of the House to the fact that we are asked by the resolution before the House this evening to express our joy at the action of that "god-like statesman," as he was termed by the hon. member for South Grey; while not Lord Kimberley alone, but the "god-like statesman" himself declared in the British Parliament in 1882, not unadvisedly, but deliberately, that this was a subject about which the Parliament of Canada had no right to interfere. In order that the House may not suppose that I am mistaken in this, let me read from the *English Herald* of 1st May, 1882:—

"Mr. CALLAN asked leave to propose the following question, which has stood in his name on the notice paper:—
"To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been called to this telegraphic despatch in the *Times* of April the 2nd, under date:—

"OTTAWA, 20th April."

"In to-day's sitting of the House of Commons of the Dominion Mr. Costigan, a Conservative, moved that an address should be presented to the Queen, praying that a form of self-government should be granted to Ireland similar to that enjoyed by Canada, and that 'clemency' should be extended to the political prisoners in Ireland. Mr. Blake, the leader of the Opposition, made a powerful speech in favor of Home Rule for Ireland. Sir John Macdonald, the Premier, also supported the resolution proposed by Mr. Costigan, which was unanimously adopted. Sir John Macdonald stated that he would see that the necessary steps were taken to have the address prepared, in order that it might be sent to the Senate for concurrence."

"Whether he will have any objection to direct that a copy of the said address be laid upon the Table of the House; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter?"

"Mr. GLADSTONE. I think when such a question relating to a public body had been for some time on the paper, it is necessary that it should be answered as soon as possible, and I propose to answer, at any rate, so much of the question as is before us."

"Mr. CALLAN. I wish to make an addition to the question, and to ask whether the right hon. gentleman is aware that since my speech was first given, the Canadian Senate, or Upper House, has confirmed the resolution?"

"Mr. GLADSTONE. No, Sir; I am not aware that the Senate had concurred in the proceedings of the Assembly. The Address was not transmitted in the regular manner. We are cognisant of the resolution having been passed, and of its contents, not only by a telegraphic report. We cannot present it to the House, because we are not in possession of the document. With regard to the substance of the resolution, the hon. gentleman has called upon me to enter upon a matter which is fitter for debate than a mere reply to a question; but, of course, I may observe that although, no doubt, the Assembly of Canada desired to assist our deliberations, the question referred to in the address appertains exclusively to the Imperial Parliament—the very words of Lord Kimberley's despatch—and the Imperial Government; and I may add, that so much of the subject matter as touches the discretion of the Executive Government—for this is part of the subject matter—had our close and constant attention before the determination of the wish expressed in the address, either from that quarter or any other quarter, had reached us in the shape of any suggestion."

It will not be now said that the expression in the despatch by which the address of this Parliament was answered was an expression unadvisedly used by Lord Kimberley. It will not be said we are not asked to sacrifice all dignity and self-respect in being asked to approach, not for the purpose of advising, not for the purpose of giving practical assistance, but simply, to use the expression of the hon. member for West Durham a few minutes ago, for the purpose of cheering on the man who said, in answer to our advice in 1882: 'I wish you to understand that this is a matter which belongs exclusively to me and with which you have nothing whatever to do.' I do not profess to concur in that opinion at all. I agree in the statement of the hon. member for West Durham, that we have the right to express our opinion, as fellow-subjects of the Empire, on that or any other question; but I do say that before this House is asked to sacrifice its dignity by approaching again the very men who have declared they have no advice to take from us, that the matter is exclusively one for themselves to consider; and that they had formed their opinion before hearing from us, at least it should be shown that some practical useful purpose is to be served and somebody to be benefited. It is for these reasons that I am in sympathy entirely with the Minister of Inland Revenue, in feeling indisposed to invite the action of Parliament upon that question again this Session. Now, however, that he has done so, I feel no hesitation in voting for his resolution, inasmuch as it expresses the adherence of this House to the principles of the address of 1882, which looked to the pacification of Ireland, the gratification of the local ambition of a great body of the people, the preservation of the rights of the minority and the integrity of the Empire; but I do say, both as one who is entirely in sympathy with the address of 1882, and as a member of this House, that I am opposed to passing any address on this subject in view of all these circumstances, and that I think the dignity and self-respect of this House will be best maintained by simply asserting what this House resolved in 1882 it adheres to to-night, and records its opinion without undertaking to present an address on the subject to the man who spurned our address before, from whom we have no reason to expect any change in this particular, although there may be a change in the question now before Parliament. There is no occasion whatever for considering that Mr. Gladstone would deem the advice of the Parliament of Canada more useful or that administration of Irish affairs was any less exclusively in the province of the Imperial Parliament in 1886 than it was in 1882. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) seems to have a contrary view, because he calls the attention of the House to the manifesto issued by Mr. Gladstone. I humbly differ from the hon. gentleman. I humbly think that Mr. Gladstone did not, in that manifesto, invite the expression and the opinion of the Parliament of Canada, and I do not believe that the influence of the Parliament of Canada at this stage of the discussion will have any useful result. If he thought it would assist in the consideration of the question in the Imperial Parliament that the opinion of the Canadian Parliament should be known, Mr. Gladstone could call it up from the Colonial Office. The Office in Downing Street can inform him of the opinions of the Government of Canada; he can call up the address of both Houses of Parliament—the first expression of Parliament, the unrescinded expression of Parliament, declared in the most formal way and conveyed to the Imperial authorities in the exercise of our rights as British subjects—and use it on the second reading of the Bill. The contention made by one of the hon. gentleman's supporters that because when a new Parliament came in it was necessary to reiterate all those resolutions seems to me an extraordinary argument. If that be so, it would be the duty of a new Parliament to adopt all the resolutions of the old one, excepting those the

Honour dissents from; it would be our duty to re-enact all our old Statutes. But we have been accustomed to suppose that that which went forward deliberately and solemnly, by the unanimous votes of both Houses, is an expression of opinion which might be said to last, at any rate, until a contrary opinion is expressed. When the hon. member for West Durham moved his resolution a few days ago, I confess it was with surprise I heard the statement, which I was bound to accept, that it was introduced in no party spirit. I felt surprised at that statement, because I supposed that the leader of the Opposition, in moving that resolution as an amendment to the motion to go into Supply, an amendment which the Government were bound, under the circumstances, to treat as a vote of want of confidence —

Mr. MILLS. Not at all.

Mr. THOMPSON. I suppose the hon. gentleman would have avowed his position was this, that he proposed to challenge on public grounds the attitude of this Government on this question; but the hon. gentleman chose to state at that stage of the discussion that it was introduced in no party spirit, and we were bound to accept that statement—although, I must say, it was with considerable difficulty I accepted it. I am glad that the strain involved in the acceptance of that proposition is no longer upon us, because the hon. gentleman, in the exceedingly pleasing and good-humoured speech which he made a few moments ago, gracefully threw off the mask, and declared, if not in so many words, in sentiment, that this which is being pushed on this House this evening is purely a party measure. The hon. gentleman evincing the greatest delight and ecstasy which I have not witnessed upon his countenance since I came to this House, and which I would be exceedingly gratified to see, if not in such a cause, in pointing out the gentlemen on this side who are unable to concur in the resolution. There he showed at once that one of the objects he had in bringing this resolution forward was to show that hon. gentlemen on this side were not a unit on this question; but I am sure nobody would accuse me in this House of imputing, from want of charity, any such motive to the hon. gentleman, when they recall the words in which I regretted to hear him assail a number of gentlemen on this side led by the Minister of Inland Revenue—gentlemen who have justified their adhesion to the principles of personal freedom and civil liberty under many trying circumstances which that hon. gentleman has never had to undergo; gentlemen who have evinced their willingness to support this cause when the hon. member for West Durham and his friends in the Liberal caucus of freedom and liberty stood mute in this House; men who raised their voices and induced this House unanimously to express an opinion in favor of Home Rule; when he assailed these persons in words which I think the hon. gentleman himself regret to go on record, when he assailed them as the Tory Irish Catholic league. I suppose that, after words like that uttered against gentlemen on this side of the House for no other reason than that they felt, for the reasons, I venture to say, which I have already stated, that it was not an opportune time, and the needs of the case did not call for them to bring forward a resolution like this, for no other reason than that they were unwilling to obtrude this question unnecessarily again and because they were unwilling to support the hon. gentleman in an appeal to the Throne made for the purpose of cheering on the gentleman, who told us in 1832, with a double voice, that this was a matter exclusively for himself, and that he was quite able to form an opinion upon it without hearing us at all, simply because we declined to join him in that address, although we adhered as faithfully to the principles of the resolutions as we did in 1832, we were to be stigmatised in the eyes of our fellow members in the House who were unable to vote with us, and in the eyes of our fellow citizens

Mr. THOMPSON,

in the country who were unable to think as we did, as the Tory Irish Catholic league. When the hon. gentleman reproaches us in these terms, I thought I was justified in assuming that the strain he put on my credulity the day before yesterday would be altogether relieved to-night. There was one other reason which was perfectly obvious, both from his remarks and from the remarks of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), for the introduction of the resolution, and that was that it was to put, if possible, in a false position my hon. colleague, the Minister of Inland Revenue. One half of the hon. gentleman's remarks two thirds of the remarks of the hon. member for South Grey were given to an assault upon that gentleman's consistency. As I have said before under the circumstances which existed in 1832 when popular opinion was not to be gained, when the good graces of Mr. Gladstone were not to be gained by the expression of opinion on this question, my hon. friend who sits beside me asked this House to join in that expression of opinion at a time when those who claim that the principles of liberty are altogether in their keeping were unwilling to express an opinion upon it until they were led by the present Minister of Inland Revenue. Nobody knows better than I do the statement that was made in the *London Times* and read to the House of Commons that the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) made a very able speech upon that occasion, showed a great deal of ability, and adopted the favorable gale which was then carrying that resolution through the House. Nobody knows better than I do the ability with which he discussed that question, and I do not wish for a moment to detract from the contribution which an eloquent speech like that made to the business of the occasion; but I am still disposed, as one of the members of this House sympathising in the amendment which has been moved this evening, to decline, notwithstanding the hon. gentleman's great eloquence and great fervor on that occasion to agree with him in the attack he made on the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, who, as I said, without the aid of the hon. gentleman, so freely tendered the day before yesterday, brought the question before the House and chose the time for doing it when, as I have said, the resolution of this House could do the most good, and we had not merely the agreeable task of cheering on Her Majesty's Prime Minister in a course which he has already adopted without the advice of Canada, and after informing Canada that she has nothing to do with the question. As one of the members of the House, as I have said, taking this view, notwithstanding what has been said this evening, I expressed my adhesion to the course and the consistency and the sincerity of the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, and I believe that the people throughout this country who sympathise with the principles expressed in this amendment, will prefer the course which the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue has adopted to the course the Opposition have adopted on this question, notwithstanding the desperate attempt that has been made to break down that gentleman's position as regards his consistency and his right to speak for his fellow countrymen and his co-religionists. But, if the hon. gentleman's words were not sufficient when he pointed with such pleasure to the dissensions in this House which his resolution had caused, if his words were not sufficient when he assailed gentlemen on this side of the House who felt so warm an interest in this question that perhaps from pardonable zeal they thought the question entirely in their own keeping, if these words were not sufficient, I should suppose the words of the hon. mover of the amendment to the amendment this evening would be quite sufficient to show that this thing has been pushed upon the House as purely a party measure and purely to put the Government in a false position upon it, which I venture to say they shall not be able to do. I need not say the hon. member for West Durham is responsible for the statements of the mover of the amendment to

the amendment, because he sat by and heard them all, he cheered them all, he failed to disallow any of them, and he declared at the end of his remarks that he intended to vote for the resolution with which the mover of the amendment to the amendment closed his speech; and that gentleman perhaps at an earlier stage than his leader intended, disclosed the whole game by stating that we were angry on this side of the House, because the wind had been taken out of our sails, because we saw that we had sacrificed an opportunity to make ourselves popular. Now, the hon. mover of the amendment to the amendment, the resolution which is going to meet the support of his leader, the hon. member for West Dunham, has declared, in a voice in which, after that, it shall be surely said he speaks for his party, that the object of bringing this whole question before the House, and especially in embarking the little resolution which he concluded his remarks by moving, is simply to outail the Government, to outail the members in favor of Home Rule on this side of the House, and to seize the opportunity which he thought and which they think we sacrificed of cultivating popularity, making ourselves popular, although the expression of the opinion of this Parliament cannot serve any useful purpose other than that of making ourselves popular, and would be, in the way in which it is proposed to express it, a sacrifice of the dignity and the consistency of this Parliament.

Mr. COURSOL. Notwithstanding the lateness of the hour, I feel that I cannot give a silent vote on this question, representing, as I do, the largest and most populous division in the Dominion, inhabited by so many thousands of Irishmen, true to their adopted land, and true to Ireland. I have had the occasion to attend meetings in favor of Home Rule, called by the most influential Irishmen of the city of Montreal. There was but one spirit, and that was in favor of the scheme proposed by Mr. Gladstone, and then and there it was said that they hoped that every effort would be made by the friends of Ireland, whenever that occasion should come, in order to strengthen the hands of Mr. Gladstone at the present moment. It is indeed a great sight to see the Premier of the British Empire coming forward with a scheme to relieve Ireland from the grievances of centuries past, and it is not surprising that the attention of the world is now rivetted on the British Parliament. From every part of the globe Mr. Gladstone has received despatches and letters of congratulation; from every part of the globe Mr. Parnell, who has behaved so nobly in behalf of Ireland, has also received, probably, the same amount of congratulation. The Legislature of the Province of Quebec sent a resolution to Mr. Gladstone, which he acknowledged with pleasure, and it now remains for the House of Commons to do the same. I believe that the 9,000,000 of Irishmen inhabiting this continent, believe that something ought to be done in this House. I think it is the opinion of all the Irishmen in Canada that something should be done here, and I believe they will be thankful to the mover of the resolution. This is no time to quarrel about politics. This is no time to say that it has been brought in by the leader of the Government or the leader of the Opposition. It is for us to decide whether the proposition before us deserves our approval, whether it will serve the purpose desired, whether it will show to England, to the British Empire, that Mr. Gladstone, in his Home Rule measure, has friends in Canada who are disposed to cheer him on in the course he has adopted. The measure may have many defects, it may not pass in its shape, but all we want to know is whether Ireland will be benefited and satisfied. If we find that the measure satisfies Irishmen, we also shall be satisfied. I am not an Irishman, but I have felt for Ireland ever since I read her history, and now at last, after so many cen-

tures of oppression, so many centuries of persecution, at last one man steps forward and brings up the measure intended to remove her grievances, and that man is the Premier of England. We are told that Mr. Gladstone held different views some time ago. I do not care what views he may have held in the past, I care for his views of to-day. I take his proposition as I find it, and I think it deserves our hearty support. I believe the day is not far distant when he will achieve that great feat of repairing the injustices of the past, that he will receive the reward he deserves, and that his brilliant career will be closed by passing a law that will be a blessing to the people who have suffered so long. For my part, I do not view this as a party measure. If the proposition of the Minister of Inland Revenue had been alone before the House, I would gladly have supported it. But if I find something more to the point, something calculated to do more good, I am bound, as a lover of Ireland, as a lover of freedom, to support the second proposition. I know that the Minister of Inland Revenue has done all he possibly could for his country. I know the love he has for Ireland, he has proved it on many occasions, and I am sure that in this instance he has been moved by the purest motives of patriotism. But that alone should not prevent us from judging all the motions before us. We are bound to take them as we find them. I think the motion of the leader of the Opposition, coupled with the amendment, is calculated to do good, and that it will have the effect of showing the position of this House and the country. It is said we have received a rebuke from England. Well, Sir, so far as I am concerned, and I believe so far as the people of this country is concerned, it is a matter of indifference whether this House received a rebuke four years ago; all we want is to accomplish our object, the position is not the same now, circumstances have changed. Are we to be told that we British subjects living in this great Dominion, have no right to lay our views at the foot of the Throne? Are we not interested in this question—perhaps even more than any other colony of the Empire? Who knows the consequences which a refusal of Home Rule might entail upon this Dominion? Who knows where trouble might come from? We might have to defend our shores with our money and our blood. I know not what might be the consequences if that measure should be refused. But if it passes I believe it is calculated to bring peace and harmony, not only to England, but to the whole world, wherever there are Irishmen, and especially in this part of America. Now, Sir, the motion of the hon. leader of the Opposition is couched in a calm, dignified tone, there is nothing in it to offend, and I am sure if it is sent by this Parliament to Mr. Gladstone, he will receive it with gratitude, and thereby correct the mistake that was made before. We ought not to think of that, if we can accomplish our end, our first object is to do good to Ireland, and we ought not to dispute about the terms, we need not be so punctilious about the terms; let us do our duty first about the cause of Ireland and of Home Rule, and if we succeed we shall be satisfied. If, on the contrary, the English Government should think fit to return such an answer as they did before, then Canada will know what she will have to do, but I presume no such thing will happen. I shall vote in favor of the amendment as it stands, hoping that it will be annexed to the motion of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I desire to say but a few words on the subject that has engaged the attention of the House this afternoon and evening. I have waited until our Irish friends in the House have had an opportunity of expressing their views, and now that they have had full opportunity, and one of our French friends has found occasion to approve of the course of the leader of the Opposition and of the resolution which he has submitted, I

who cannot claim to be either Irish by birth or Irish by descent, recognize that fact, and at the same time venture to claim that I am in a position in which I may be permitted to say a few words on this question. I conceive this to be a question that is more than an Irish question. These resolutions are introduced into the Canadian Parliament, and as a Canadian, and as a representative in the Canadian Parliament, I feel I am at liberty to express my views in regard to the substance of them, and to intimate what my views are in that direction. I think it is eminently proper that in the Canadian Parliament, composed of the representatives of various Provinces, which enjoy to the full the privilege of local self-government, such resolutions should be introduced. I was one of those in the House, who, in 1882, was very glad, along with almost all the members in the House, to ratify by my assent and by my vote on that occasion what I believed to be a correct principle, that local self-government should be given to the people of Ireland, permitting them to manage their own local affairs as to them might seem right and proper. And therefore when the leader of the Opposition has to day placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker, a resolution declaring that we adhere to the principles we enunciated at that time and evidenced by our vote and that he desires further to express to Her Majesty our belief that the principles we then advocated have been incorporated in a measure that has been brought down by the Imperial Cabinet and submitted to the House of Commons, I feel that I desire to express my approval of that resolution and give it my support, and, if I have an opportunity, my vote. It is to be regretted very much, I think, that on a question of this great consequence, on a question on which it is so desirable that we should all be united, an attempt should have been made to introduce an element of party strife. It is particularly to be regretted that the evident intention to introduce if possible party strife into the discussion of this question should come from those who have constituted themselves, as it were, the special champions of the Irish people and of the Irish cause. They have seen fit to accuse the leader of the Opposition of acting from party motives in introducing his resolution. The Minister of Justice has not thought it beneath him to charge upon the leader of the Opposition that he was actuated by purely party motives in introducing this resolution. I excuse some of the statements he made to-night, as I feel that the hon. gentleman understood he was in an awkward position when he intimated that he would vote down the proposal of the leader of the Opposition. His charge was that the hon. gentleman had moved it for purely party purposes. What was the evidence he gave? Can any hon. gentleman in the action or in the words of the leader of the Opposition point to a single word or a single circumstance that would corroborate such a statement? Hon. gentlemen opposite say the proof is to be found in the leader of the Opposition having moved this motion as an amendment on going into Committee of Supply, when it became, as a matter of course, a vote of non-confidence in the Administration. The hon. gentleman knows that that statement is not correct. He knows that the leader of the Opposition moved the motion on that occasion, because it was only upon such an occasion that it was possible for him to move it during this Session; and more than that, the hon. gentleman took care, when he made the motion, to announce that it was not made in a party sense and not as a leader of a party, but in the hope that it would receive the unanimous approval of the House. It was only necessary for the Minister to act on the resolution in the spirit in which it was proposed, just as was done in 1882 when the Costigan resolutions were introduced at a precisely similar time, to have removed it entirely out of the region of party politics, had they been anxious to do so and united on their side of the House, and thus a unanimous vote on this occasion.

MR. PATTERSON (Brant).

sion might have been secured as it was in 1882. When the leader of the House objected to the motion coming up as an amendment to Supply the hon. gentleman announced his willingness to withdraw his motion if a day was appointed, and immediately the leader of the Opposition agreed. Subsequently, the leader of the Government made another stipulation that it should not be brought up as an amendment to go into Supply but as a subsequent motion; and the leader of the Opposition signified his acquiescence. He did more than that. When the Minister of Inland Revenue suggested that by conference they could probably arrange a resolution that would secure the unanimous support of the House he said he desired a conference with the hon. gentlemen opposite, and that he would be happy to receive suggestions, and to arrive at some motion that would pass the House unanimously. Where then is the proof of the charge laid against the leader of the Opposition that he has introduced this resolution in a purely party spirit and for party gains and purposes? The Minister of Justice charged that when the Costigan resolutions were introduced, one of which expressed the hope that persons then confined in gaol might be released, the voice of the leader of the Opposition was not raised on that occasion. Does not the hon. gentleman know that on that very occasion the leader of the Opposition seconded the motion. Does not he know, and if he was not present has he not heard that such was the case? I well recall that his eloquent advocacy of the cause of local self-government for the Irish people captivated the entire parliamentary assembly, and that the cheers rang out not only from his supporters, but from those who were politically opposed to him. I have here the testimony, in contradiction of the charge of the Minister of Justice that the leader of the Opposition had sat silent upon that occasion. I have the testimony of the Minister of Inland Revenue himself. In his speech delivered in this House the other day he said:

"Mr. Speaker, on a former occasion, when this same subject was discussed before this Parliament, no man was seated in this Chamber and listened to the hon. gentleman when he spoke on that occasion; admired him more sincerely than I did, or was more ready to congratulate him upon the very able speech he delivered on that occasion."

And yet, Sir, the Minister of Justice rose and charged when these resolutions were passing through—alluding to one of them desiring the release of the persons then in prison—the leader of the Opposition had remained silent. I tell you, Sir, and I tell the House that long before the Costigan resolutions were introduced into this Parliament this measure of Home Rule for the people of Ireland was in the heart, and found expression from the lips, of the hon. leader of the Opposition. Two years and four days before the Costigan resolutions were introduced into this House, when my hon. friend was speaking of the Canadian Pacific Railway and of the probable immigration we would receive into our country, reciting the fact which he much regretted that we did not receive so large a number of immigrants from Ireland as he desired we might, he pointed out what he deeply regretted, that unfortunately the Irish Catholic population of Ireland, when they left their country, owing to the embittered feelings which existed between Ireland and England, instead of seeking our shores where they could find comfortable homes and work their fortunes, they sought the shores of another country and became settlers of, and helpers in, building up a foreign nation. Upon that occasion the leader of the Opposition, after deploring the fact I have pointed out, said this:

"But I hope for great things for Ireland and the Empire from the evenness of the last few days. I hope and trust that the advent to power of the Liberal party, supported by a great majority of decided Liberals and Radicals, will result in fresh measures of relief and justice to Ireland, which will tend still further to weaken her old feelings of hostility and disaffection, and to make the Empire in this regard an United Empire. I hope we shall see among other things a moderate measure of Home Rule for Ireland, and witness the application of that measure

the creation and maintenance of true and real bonds of Union between Ireland and the rest of the so-called United Kingdom."

That was the sentiment deep in the heart of the leader of the Opposition, a sentiment which found expression from his lips two years and four days before the Costigan resolutions were moved at all; and yet, although that is the record of the hon. gentleman, he is charged by hon. gentlemen on the other side, now that the desire of his heart in that respect seems to be approaching completion, now when he sees that by another effort it may become almost an accomplished fact, they say that after having waited, after having given them every opportunity to move from the other side, in order, if possible, that a unanimous vote might be secured, after waiting until he found from the newspapers that they would not move, he comes forward and moves his resolution—a resolution which is simply an affirmation of the one which was adopted by hon. gentlemen on both sides in 1882, and stating further that we desired to inform Her Majesty that this House hails with joy the submission by Her Majesty's Government to the Parliament of the United Kingdom, of a measure recognising the principle of local self-government for Ireland—they now find fault with him for moving this resolution. Is it not meet and proper thing that he who desired it in 1880 and expressed a belief that through the restoration to power of a Liberal Administration this measure of Home Rule would become law—is it not fitting, now when he sees this measure actually submitted to the Imperial Parliament, by that distinguished statesman and that it stands a chance of becoming the law of the land, that he should desire to place on record our approval of that principle, and lend the weight of the opinion of the Parliament of Canada in behalf of what we conceive to be a principle that will be conducive of good and good only. And who, Sir, intercepts the motion of my hon. friend, and desires to prevent this House from stating that they hail with joy the introduction of this measure? Why, Sir, it remained for the man who moved the resolution in 1882, expressing a desire that this might be brought about—it remained for him, and a sad task it must have been, to seek to intercept the motion of the leader of the Opposition, giving us the opportunity of expressing our joy at seeing likely to be accomplished what we asked should be done by them. And yet we find he takes shelter from that position, which is not, I venture to say, a creditable position, which is, I think, a position he must regret—though it is perhaps not too late for him to retrace his steps, by moving to withdraw his amendment in order that the resolution of the leader of the Opposition may be adopted—the excuse he gives for intercepting that resolution—and he embodies it in his resolution—is, that because when the resolutions of 1882 were sent to Her Majesty, Earl Kimberley replied in what he calls a snub to the Parliament of Canada, therefore, as the Minister of Justice said, it would be beneath our dignity to again adopt that course. Why, Sir, I am at a loss to perceive how it is a greater sacrifice of dignity upon our part respectfully to reaffirm the position we took at that time, and to express joy that those who differed from us at that time have embraced our views and are acting upon them, than that we should place on the journals of the House of Canada that we were snubbed, as they term it, by the Colonial Secretary, and that we desired to place it on the journals of the House and intend to make it our guide for all time to come, in order that we might take care that never more should we approach the foot of the Throne. I think the sacrifice of dignity on our part will be to carry the amendment of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, which is, in effect, to acknowledge that we received a snub—if snub it be—that we accept it as just, and that we claim the privilege of putting it on our journals, where it may always be before our eyes to prevent us from ever again doing such a thing, and prevent us from expressing our joy that a measure we approved of at that time and desired to

see submitted has been submitted. And what is the position of the Minister of Inland Revenue upon this very question? Has he changed his views? No; he tells us that the reply of Earl Kimberley did not change his opinion at all. He said:

"I agree with the hon. gentleman in thinking that we had a perfect right to send the address we did send. It was couched in respectful language; it was moderate in its tone; it covered the principle involved; and as we took the ground that the question affected our interests in this country, we felt that we were acting within our clear right."

And still thinking we did nothing wrong, thinking that we were acting within our clear rights, he hesitates to stand upon his rights and desires to have entered on our journals the fact that what we considered to be our rights was denied to us by the Imperial Government, and the fact that they sent a reply of this kind he acquiesces in as a paramount reason why we should not again approach the Throne and express our views to Her Majesty. I say it is to be regretted that the hon. gentleman found himself obliged to take such a course; it is to be regretted that a gentleman to whom we will endeavor to give credit for heartily desiring that the principle of local self-government should be accorded to the Irish people, should himself be a party to intercept a motion which is calculated to strengthen the hands of the man who is endeavoring to give effect to the views which we then expressed. What will be the effect of the amendment of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue? It is simply a resolution saying we said so and so in 1882, we think so now, but Her Majesty's Government told us at that time that no matter what we thought we had no business to tell them, that therefore we will not tell them again what we do think in reference to this matter. But we will put it upon the journals of our own House, that notwithstanding what Earl Kimberley said in 1882, we think so still; and it is there. It is not to be transmitted to the British Government or to Mr. Gladstone or to Her Majesty; it is not to be sent beyond the four walls of this Chamber, unless some enterprising newspaper should see fit to cable it across, which would not be the act of this Parliament at all. Sir, I say that Canadians value the liberty of local self-government, as they they do value it, having longed lived under and enjoyed that blessing, it is meet and right that we should signify that our feelings are unchanged in this respect, and signify it to Her Majesty's Government—should signify that we, who are in a position to know that the granting of local self-government, instead of weakening, strengthens to the greatest degree the tie that binds free people together, believe that as it has been in our case so it will be in the case of Ireland—that we believe that that country, misgoverned and down-trodden as she has been for many years, being once accorded the right which should be hers, to manage her own local affairs, instead of cherishing feelings of envy and bitterness toward those who have misgoverned it, will recognise that at last justice is about to be done, and that this will enkindle in the people of the Ireland feelings of kindness, of unity and of regard towards the British Empire, which, instead of being weakened, will be strengthened in a very material degree. If no higher reason, based on principles of justice and right, existed, although that reason does exist, why the Irish people should have the rights and liberties we enjoy, we find a potent reason in the fact that our material interests are bound up in this question in no slight degree. As stated in the resolutions of 1882, we cannot hope while the present state of things and the present feelings exist in Ireland, to receive the immigration from that island which we are entitled to receive. But once let peace, good will and unity be brought about between Ireland and the rest of the Empire, by the concession of justice in this respect, and then may we hope to have great accessions to our population from those who may

leave the shores of that Island to seek their fortunes beyond the sea. We, Sir, are entitled to have them in our midst; we desire to have them here; we open our arms to them, and we say to them: Come over to us, we have fertile lands which we will give you free to settle on; and if they were animated by friendship and love for the mother land, I believe we should be successful in obtaining large numbers of them. I noticed one remark made by an hon. gentleman opposite, who announced himself as entirely opposed to this principle of local self-government for Ireland. He pointed out that we did not know what the result would be, although it was certain that the measure would be fraught with evil consequences; and he gave as a reason why he should vote for the amendment of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, that it would be productive of less ill-effect, in the direction in which he looked for ill-effect, than the others. I have only to remind you that when great constitutional changes have taken place in this country, there have been those who have hesitated and have seen danger in them. There are those living in Canada to-day who have seen great constitutional changes which they regarded as fraught with danger to the well-being, the peace of this country, and who, to-day, enjoying the blessings thus secured, would be the last to relinquish them. Is it not a matter of history that when it was first proposed to grant municipal institutions to the people of this country, there were those who denounced them as sucking republics, who said our safety as a people would be endangered if we allowed the control of municipal affairs to pass into the hands of the people? Municipal institutions, however, were granted; and to-day no institutions are more highly prized by the people of Ontario, and I believe by the people of the other Provinces, than those municipal institutions. No man would willingly part with them; and yet as grave fears were expressed about the granting of those rights to the people as we before expressed about granting self-government to Ireland. There may be those who express alarm; but I am not one of those who can see where danger can arise. It is impossible for a Canadian to see how the Empire can be weakened by doing justice to one portion of it which has not received justice hitherto. It is impossible for a Canadian, who sees that by giving self-government to this Dominion, the Empire has bound it to itself by a stronger bond than before, and who sees that by giving self-government to the Provinces, they have been more strongly united together than before—I say it is impossible for a Canadian who has seen all this, to see how danger can arise to the Empire from applying the same principle to that important portion of the Empire. I would be glad, if an opportunity were given to me, to vote for the resolution introduced by the hon. leader of the Opposition. I would desire to express my joy that now at last there has been a measure submitted to the Imperial Parliament by the Premier of the Empire, to secure that boon to the Irish people; and I am of the opinion expressed in the words of the amendment offered by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), that the events that have taken place since 1882 have strengthened the conviction we then entertained, that it was a proper and a desirable thing to grant such a measure. I shall therefore have much pleasure in voting for the amendment of the hon. member for North Wellington, which will express to Her Majesty, as we have clearly a right to do that we hold the same views now that we held in 1882, and that we rejoice to know that those views are now embodied in a measure submitted to the Imperial Parliament for ratification and approval. I shall have much pleasure, Sir, in supporting this resolution, and I only regret that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue has sought to supplant the original resolution by the introduction of a resolution that will not tend in any material degree, I fear, to strengthen the hands of the right hon. gentleman engaged in this great task, but whose hands would be most materially strength-

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

ened if the original resolution were to receive, as it ought in my opinion to receive, the approval of the members of this Chamber.

Mr. MITCHELL. At this late hour I will crave the indulgence of the House for but a very few minutes. I do it because it is the first time I have had an opportunity from my place in Parliament of expressing my opinion on the question of Home Rule for Ireland. It is needless to argue at this age of history the question of whether the Irish people should have Home Rule or not; it is universally admitted that grievances have existed and that the peace of Ireland has suffered from the want of that power of self-government within the Island itself, which is almost universally admitted to be now necessary. I will, therefore, not now discuss that side of the question, because I think there is but one opinion on all sides of this House, and that is that the action taken by the right hon. the First Minister of England, that the principle of the Bill which he submitted—I am not going so far as to say I will endorse all the details, I think there are many the right hon. gentleman knows he will require to alter—but I say the principle of the Bill is one which will be universally admitted in this House to be of absolute necessity in order to secure the peace of the Empire. Those who say to us that we are interfering with a subject which is outside the region and power and rights of this Parliament are but very few indeed. At one time that contention may have been sustained, but to-day it is almost universally admitted—certainly universally within this House, because the votes of hon. gentlemen will show this whether they vote for the resolution or for either of the amendments, and I presume every hon. gentleman will vote for one of them—and no one pretends that the Parliament of Canada, which has among its members numbers of Irishmen, both Protestants and Catholics, and a large number of men who depend upon Irishmen of both persuasions for their seats, has not the right to express its opinion on this matter to the Imperial Government. When we look at what the population of Canada is composed of, its mixed character, the varied influences, and when we consider the strong sympathies which all classes in the community feel in the agitation going on in the mother land, cannot doubt the propriety of the course we are about to take. Not only the peace of the Empire, but that of all the colonies, depends largely whether that vexed question will be settled satisfactorily or not. When we find the right hon. the First Minister of England is receiving assurances of sympathy from foreign land, from Irishmen south of the border, and from other British colonies, it is our duty, as well as our right, to give expression to the wish which in our heart we feel that every effort should be made to meet the just expectations of that country which has suffered so much from maladministration. I will say no more on this point, but simply express my opinion as to what is desirable we should do to sustain the hands of Mr. Gladstone. I regret very much to find that the reasonable motion of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) was not accepted by the Administration. Let anyone take up that resolution and let him take up the amendment moved by the Minister of Inland Revenue, and say whether there is any very substantial difference between the two, except this that the resolution of the hon. member for West Durham is more explicit, more to the point, conveys better the idea we desire to convey, conveys in the strongest manner possible the desire of our people through their representatives in Parliament to press upon Her Majesty, Her Majesty's advisors, and the people of England, the fact that we in Canada, comprising between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000 people, admittedly the brightest gem in the crown of England, her foremost colony, one that has shown by her enterprise that she is prepared to receive the homeless millions of Europe—sympathise with Mr. Gladstone; and our opinion should

be expressed in a manner in which there will be no uncertainty sound or doubt. If the hon. member for West Durham had not moved his resolution, and the Minister of Inland Revenue had submitted his as an original proposition I would have supported it with pleasure; but in my opinion it is not as strong as the other, because it is simply an expression of the opinion of this Parliament, while the motion of the hon. member for West Durham is a direct address to the foot of the Throne. If the motion of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue had been presented in the first instance, I would have gladly supported it, and I feel that, after the unanimous expression of the opinion of this Parliament which we gave in 1882, when I had not the honor of being in Parliament, it is a matter of regret that on this occasion we should not act unanimously. If there be a division on the motion of the hon. member for West Durham, and if the House divides on the motion of the hon. member for Wellington and the amendment of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue is carried, I suppose it will be carried on a divided House. That is a fact that I would very much regret. I feel that if we are sending an expression of opinion on so vital and important a question to a large number of our fellow-subjects on the other side of the water, we ought to send an unanimous expression of opinion, and I would ask the Ministry whether, even at this late hour, they could not find that it would not derogate from their dignity or influence, but, on the contrary, lead them to be more respected in this House and country, if, in order to command unanimity, they should withdraw the motion of the Minister of Inland Revenue. The hon. member for West Wellington would then withdraw his and the first resolution go as proposed. But if the Government are determined to press for a division, the country will hold them responsible for it. The hon. member for West Durham, who waited two months after the House opened before he submitted his resolution, I am sure, though I am not in his confidence, knew nothing of this motion, and would have been willing at once to accept the proposition of the Minister of Inland Revenue, if it had been submitted in the first instance. If, with so little difference between the two resolutions, a division is had, the country will hold the Administration of the day responsible for preventing that unanimity upon this question which we all desire. That is all I have to say. In sending home a resolution on this subject, I do not want to vote as the hon. member for Muskoka said he would for a resolution that will do the least good. I want to vote for the strongest resolution, and therefore I propose to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Wellington, and, failing that, for the motion of the hon. member for West Durham.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In the few remarks I offered in placing my motion in amendment to the motion made by the hon. member for West Durham, in your hands, Sir, I gave my reasons for moving that motion. I stated that I still adhered to the view I entertained, that I thought it would be better to leave that unanimous expression of the Parliament of Canada to have its full force and effect than to count a division and a debate such as we have had to-night creating division on the question and inevitably resulting in a divided vote of this House. I was sincere in taking that view. I was actuated by a desire to do that which was best in the interests of those who have at heart, above all their political feelings, the welfare of the Irish people and the success of their present struggle. The hon. gentleman who moved the resolution to which mine has been moved in amendment has in his usual eloquent terms tried to impress upon the House the great value of an expression of this new Parliament upon the question. He has pointed out what strength it would give to Mr. Gladstone in his present praiseworthy efforts to give

to Ireland what has been so long withheld from that unhappy country. I wish to say to the House and to the country that there is no position in the gift of this country or any other country, there is no pecuniary consideration which would influence me or prevent me from taking that stand which would be best calculated to promote the interests of the Irish people and the heartfelt views of the Irish Canadians in this country. I listened with pain, as I have often had to do before, to the remarks of the hon. gentleman from South Grey (Mr. Landerkin). In the first place, he stated with regard to the resolution moved in 1882 that there was no call for it, that it was inexpedient to move it then, though he thought it was quite expedient to move it now, and that moving it at that time looked as if it was moved for party purposes. Mr. Speaker, in moving it at that time, I labored under greater disadvantages than any gentleman who might propose a similar resolution at present. I agree with the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) that the feeling in Canada in favor of the movement in Ireland has not abated. I think the sentiment in Canada as well as in every other civilised country in growing daily in favor of Home Rule for Ireland. I have no doubt about that, but I say, if the expression of this Parliament is of any value to the leader of the Government who is now proposing to grant a measure of Home Rule to that country, let him refer to the unanimous verdict of this Parliament which is within his reach, the address passed by both Houses and presented to Her Majesty in 1882, and he can use that with authority. I need not repeat what I have already stated, and what has been better stated by my colleague the Minister of Justice, that the contention has been a little strained that, because a new Parliament has come in, that resolution is of no force unless it is renewed by this Parliament, I say it has all that force it had on the day it was passed until some adverse resolution is adopted by the Parliament of Canada. It is true that we are not the same in *personnel*, that we are not the same Parliament, but we were the voice of Canada at that time, and the expression of the people of Canada through their representatives has never been reversed up to the present time. It may be reversed to-night. It may be, if a vote is taken, that it will be weakened, I hope I shall not be held responsible for that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. You certainly will.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Hon. gentlemen say that I certainly shall be. I am prepared to take the responsibility of any act I perform. I have always been prepared to do that, and before I finish, I will have a few words to say in regard to that responsibility. But I must say, in concluding the few remarks I have to make in reply to the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), that he stated that I was a private member of this House at that time, and that now I am a member of the Government, and that makes all the difference. Is that the value the hon. gentleman places upon a position to which a very considerable salary is attached? Does the hon. gentleman value the position of a Cabinet Minister, to which a considerable salary is attached, for the pecuniary advantages which it entails? I do not, and I have no hesitation in saying that the man who accepts a position as a Cabinet Minister and has to endure the slanders, the cowardly slanders which are uttered against him, will find that they more than compensate for the salary he receives. Some men may think that, because I am a poor man, the salary of \$7,000 a year is a great item to me. Those who know me, know that it has not the slightest influence upon me, that to-morrow morning, I could step out of the Government of which I am a member, if I had reason to do so, and could trust in the health and constitution which God has given me to earn an honest and independent living. Yet these men who boast that they are

the representatives of religious and national feeling in this country tell me I am cowardly now because I do not think as they do, because I do not choose to endorse the views they express here. With regard to the question of Home Rule, I have been what I am to-night, a sincere friend of that movement from the first day it started in Ireland and in this country. I can refer to the first prominent meeting that was held by an Irish organisation in this country in the city of Quebec, at a time when Home Rule was not so popular in this Parliament, when Irish sentiments were not so pleasant to the majority of gentlemen on that side of the House, when Irishmen were called Degans. I was invited to go to that meeting in Quebec and to put in an appearance on a public platform in favor of Home Rule and a reform in the land system of that country. Other prominent Irishmen were invited. One gentleman who was a very prominent Irishman on that side of the House was invited, and he sent a statement that he was suffering under a bad cold and could not go. I was not suffering under a bad cold and I did go, and I was one of the first who stood on a platform in this country to advocate Home Rule for Ireland, while the hon. gentleman who sent the statement that he was suffering from a cold, spoke for three hours in this House on that very same night while I was speaking in Quebec in favor of Home Rule. And yet I am to be taunted, and my motives are to be assailed, and I am to be told that I was a House Ruler until I got into the Government. My position in the Government of the day is perhaps a peculiar one. I have confessed before that I do not owe it to any particular ability that I possess, to any extraordinary talents with which I have been endowed. It is true that I have served my country as a public man in a humble capacity for a number of years. It is true that I have discharged my duty to the best of my ability, but I am quite free to admit that there are many men in Canada and in our party who are not in the Government who have abilities of a far higher order than mine. It is quite true, I am willing to confess that I owe my position to the fact that the leader of the Government believed that a portion of the people to which I belong, that is the Catholic people of this country, would have confidence in me as representing their special interests in that Government, that I would be true to their interests and would represent them faithfully as far as my abilities would enable me. From the day I entered that Cabinet until now, I have never forgotten the thoughts that occurred to me at the time my name was suggested. Let no one suppose that I entered it blindfolded; let no one suppose that I did not foresee the difficulties that loomed up before me, the cowardly attacks likely to be made upon me for political purposes. My only reason for entering the Cabinet, my only reason for remaining in it at present, is that, while, discharging my duties as a public man, and endeavoring to promote the peace and happiness of all classes so far as in my power lay, I might also specially benefit those whose interests it was my duty to advocate and to guard. Now, Sir, what treachery have I committed against the Irish people that I should be denounced by a newspaper because I did not fall in with a movement which called upon me to resign my seat on account of the unfortunate occurrences which followed the North-West rebellion. I committed no treason; I still believe that I was discharging my duty according to the well understood wishes of the large majority of those people whom I believe I represented; and I give you my word, Mr. Speaker, and I give the hon. gentleman opposite my word, that I have no desire to retain the position of honor and trust I hold now, one single hour longer than I can do so while enjoying the confidence of that people. If there is any fair and reasonable indication on the part of my Irish friends in this country that I no longer enjoy their confidence, without a word of complaint, without a regret at all, or feeling of disappoint-

Mr. COSTIGAN,

ment, I will retire peacefully from the position I hold, and trust to my ability to earn the few crumbs that are necessary for my maintenance during the few days longer I may have to live. I represent the same constituency now for 25 years, and hon. gentlemen talk of my playing the part of a demagogue! No Irishman in my part of the country could have held that seat as I have held it—not because there were not Irishmen more able than I, more worthy of the confidence that has been reposed in me, but because circumstances were in my favor. I had been born and brought up in that country. My father before me did business in that country, and became associated with every French elector in that country, enjoyed the respect of the people. I came forward as a young man, grown up among the French people. It was the French people who elected me, not the Irish people, because the Irish people in my constituency, are a very small minority. Did I play the demagogue for the last twenty-five years in holding that constituency, even against candidates who were brought out against me from among the French people themselves? The question of nationality was raised by supporters of hon. gentleman opposite, and an opponent was selected from amongst the French residents, and the first time he appealed to the electors he said: I need no introduction to you, the blood that flows in my veins is the same blood which flows in your veins. You have been long enough represented by an Irishman, now is the time to show that you are worthy of the blood that flows in your veins and have a representative of your own. I answered that gentleman at a meeting of four or five hundred persons, among whom there were not forty-five English-speaking electors, and I told him that I never knew how cowardly a man on that side of politics could be. I said: You are addressing a purely French body of electors and you have not faith in your own nationality, and you wish now to depend upon the sympathy which should properly exist between you and them in order to support me. You tell me now that an Irishman should not enjoy their confidence; I am proud of being an Irishman, and as an Irishman I am able to discharge my duties so well to the French electors in my county that I can come back with confidence and ask them to support me again. Well, Sir, I have always been proud to be able to say that I have never lost the occasion of representing the French people of that county, and they have continued to give me their support, notwithstanding the national appeals made against me. Therefore the attack that has been made upon me has no effect except to pain me to some extent. It is always painful when any man feels that he is trying to do what is best, that he is acting honestly, and still to be so misrepresented. I know this, that I have heard men make attacks upon me and impugn my motives, who knew in their hearts that they were making a cowardly and unjust attack, and they were doing it for paltry political purposes. I can assure the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landarkin) that the salary attached to the position of a public man is not so very tempting when he considers the slanders, the injustice and the unjust accusations to which he is liable, and which he cannot resent, as often I would like to resent it, in a more striking manner than in mere words. Now, with regard to this subject which has aroused the sympathies of hon. gentlemen opposite, with regard to that enthusiasm of which they boast when they wish to fly to the succor of every suffering people, and of every suffering class of people, I can only say what I said before, and repeat the saying of a man who had some experience, who had been deceived by a friend, and who said: "If he deceives me once, it is his fault; if he deceives me twice it is my fault." Hon. gentlemen opposite boast of their liberality. Let me remind them that they have proved false to their profession of liberality on more than one occasion. They talk of their love of freedom and fair play, and that it makes

no difference to them what attitude the Catholics of this country may take with regard to them, because the Catholics know that they will get justice from the Liberal party whether they oppose them or not. These are fine sentiments, Mr. Speaker, in theory, but they do not tally with the practice of hon. gentlemen opposite. When they defeated the Government led by the present Premier in 1873, they knew that they had an Irishman in their ranks who had contributed to their victory and who, in point of ability and education was equal to their best man. They knew that they were scarce in material in forming their Government, but scarce as they were of material—which was proved by the fact that they were obliged to go out of their ranks to fill up their Ministry—they were unable even then to extend to the Catholics that great, broad measure of justice to which the hon. gentleman just alluded. They refused to do justice to a distinguished Catholic who supported them, who had helped to bring them to power, to Mr. Anglin, who was a devoted follower of their own and as able as any man upon their side of the House; they had to exclude him because he was an Irish Catholic, and for no other reason. Now we are to be told that they alone can properly appreciate what belongs to true liberality and that they alone can give a fair distribution of justice to all classes and creeds in this country. I say that will not go down. I say more than that. If they will go back over their actions perhaps they will be able to see the error of their ways in the future; but I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that not only did they exclude one of their prominent supporters from the Government at that time because he was an Irish Catholic, but they knocked down every Irish Catholic they put in nomination in the Province of Ontario, and they put them up to use the fact in other constituencies. The proof is they have not brought an Irish Catholic to Parliament. They have failed to prove that liberality of which they have boasted so much to-night. I might also refer to another fact that is worthy of some notice. The hon. gentlemen, who have vied with each other to-night to prove that my attachment to my people and my interest in my people is not so warm and sympathetic as it ought to be, belong principally to the Province of Ontario. It strikes me as a remarkable circumstance that in that Provincial Legislature, which is controlled so thoroughly, fully and completely, by the Liberals, some resolution was not offered congratulating Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Parnell, the Irish people or at all events somebody. Why were they silent? Why has there never been a resolution moved in that Assembly? As I told a member of that body, who said it was the duty of this Parliament to speak out on this great question, that it was strange no motion had been passed by that Legislature, which usually put itself on a level with the Dominion Parliament, and that when they had done so they might dictate to us. I said: You have remained silent up to the present and have never uttered a single word of congratulation to Mr. Gladstone for his Home Rule measure. Still, unless we take any motion that the leader of the Opposition chooses to offer to this side of the House our motives are to be called in question. I say with regard to the question now before the House that my earnest endeavors have been to prevent a discussion which would weaken the hands of Mr. Gladstone himself, if he chooses to use what we placed in his hands in 1882, the solid vote of this Parliament in favor of the principle of Home Rule. I said I was afraid any attempt to deal with this question again might not result as favorably as it did on that occasion. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) did not choose to interrupt him—I am sorry to say did not fairly represent me when he alluded to the reasons I gave for not complying with the request of the deputation sent from St. Patrick's Literary Association. He said after counting the House, after counting noses I came to the conclusion that there

might be three who would not vote, and therefore on account of those three I was afraid to submit a motion to the House. The hon. gentleman surely knows I did not make use of any such language. The hon. gentleman heard me correct the false report of what I did say which appeared in the *Free Press*; he heard me rise and put the member for South Grey right on that subject, who was mistaking what I said for the reason of course that he was not in the House and did not hear my explanation before. But the member for West Durham did hear it. I did not say that it was on account of three members or that I had counted noses or anything of that kind; but I did say there was a probability that a division might take place and we might not succeed in getting the unanimous vote we had in 1882, and if not, it would be much better not to disturb that vote or break its effect before the country or weaken its power in the hands of those who might legitimately use it. I feel that in this Parliament we are not all agreed upon any subject that comes before us. I feel that on few questions can we get a unanimous vote; but I feel that the proposition I have made is one so reasonable that if a unanimous vote can be reached at all it will be on that motion, which asks this new Parliament to re-affirm what was expressed in 1882, and to express further than that, which my resolution does, the hope that the British Parliament may pass a measure granting Home Rule to Ireland, and thus removing the cause of discontent which has unfortunately existed in that country. The adoption of my motion by a unanimous vote of the House will strengthen the hands of Mr. Gladstone far more, and will be a greater endorsement of the policy of Home Rule than the motion of the hon. member for West Durham or that of the hon. member for North Wellington, who proposed an amendment, which simply means cutting off my resolution and tacking the amendment to the amendment to the motion of the hon. member for West Durham. I am glad to know that even the hon. member for West Durham in some things is open to correction. He is so perfect in his idea of things; he criticises the actions of every hon. member so closely, and is so severe upon those who fail to attain perfection in every subject, that it is somewhat of a relief to my mind to find that even the hon. gentleman has failed to know what it was necessary to move on this occasion in order to express the views of the House on the subject of Home Rule for Ireland, and it was only after the hon. member for North Wellington had brought his genius to bear, and used that eloquence for which he is so well known in this House, that the hon. member for West Durham was convinced that he did not know how to prepare the motion on this subject. My duty will be to sustain the motion I put before the House and to take the consequences of it, and to take those consequences honestly. I will not do, as the hon. member for West Durham has done, refer to personal matters. The hon. gentleman alluded to an occasion when he found me sitting on the back benches and that afterwards I came and sat on the front bench, when it was a question of resigning my seat in the Government. The hon. gentleman has made considerable capital out of the matter and has ridiculed me considerably before this House. It has been his special duty, added to those great duties that he performs so ably, to criticise every act of mine since Parliament has been called together, not only to criticise every act of mine, but to do so in the most ungenerous way; to catechise and criticise every word I say in regard to the business of the Department over which I preside, as if it were his business to show that I was entirely unfit for the position I hold. Well, I do not overestimate my own abilities. I do not think that whatever faults I have that hon. gentlemen in this House will say that I am wanting in sufficient modesty to acknowledge my own deficiencies. But while it is true that I did take a seat upon the back benches, while it is true that the question of whether I shall remain in the

Government or not was unsettled for a short time, the hon. gentleman should not have criticised me too severely for that. The reasons which impelled me to take the course I did, in offering to withdraw from the Government, were reasons which were honorable to myself, were reasons which would be satisfactory to my people, if I could make them known; and the reasons which induced me to reserve the decision and retain my seat were equally honorable to myself and the leader of the Government who offered to make that arrangement with me. But the hon. gentleman was liable to be found changing seats also. There was a time when he reminded me of a school to which I used to go, where the rule was that only one boy should go out at a time. A board was placed next the door, and a boy on going out had to turn this board, to show whether he was in or out. At one period of the hon. gentleman's history it appears to me that a board like that would have been useful to his friends, to tell them his position. It is true the hon. gentleman has changed since that time. Although there have been some indications of a little dissatisfaction, of a little cross pulling between himself and his followers, still he has not gone out. Well, the position is different; he has at last become leader of the party, since he came back into public life, and he has taken the position which was filled with credit by the hon. gentleman whom he supplanted. I say since that time he is not so restless; he has not gone in and out so often, although I daresay he feels sometimes as he did on an occasion not long ago, when he found himself and his party were divided on a question on which they thought they could ride into power, and I daresay on that occasion he thought of his old habit of playing in and out. But being the leader, the same reasons did not exist. I daresay he did not feel comfortable amongst his own followers, to serve under any man as leader, and I think that was one of the reasons why he was so discontented—that he had to serve under another leader, and he is now more contented because he has the leadership in his own hands. I will vote against any amendment that may be proposed in order to reach my own motion. I believe that my motion will recommend itself to a majority of this House, and I think it will meet the reasonable expectations of every man who wishes to see harmony in this country, which is the subject of our discussion to-night.

An hon. MEMBER. Harmony and peace on that side of the House, you mean.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Well, the harmony and peace we secure on this side. We do not know all the little differences that occur on that side. We have not the means of prying into secrets which were used in olden times to get the secrets of his side of the House. We do not intend to stoop to such means; but if we may judge by appearances there is room for a little of that kind of thing over there, and if I do not mistake it will take some of them all they can do to harmonise the differences which have occurred between certain gentlemen in their own party. I take the full responsibility of voting against any proposition made against the motion which I agreed to move in amendment of the motion made by the leader of the Opposition. I will not take the decision of the member for South Grey as to whether I represent the Irish element or not or any portion of it. I will not take the decision of the hon. leader of the Opposition as to whether I am doing that which I ought to do as an Irishman to strengthen the hands of my Irish friends who are advocating Home Rule. But if the day should come that it appears to the people most interested in this question that they have reason to believe I have failed in the proper discharge of my duty, I will pay the penalty of not having their confidence any longer. That is the proof I give, when there is reason for them to believe that I no longer enjoy their confidence, and if the hon. gentleman will make the

Mr. COSTIGAN.

same proposition and carry it out honestly the Reform ranks would be thinned wonderfully in this House.

House then divided on amendment (Mr. McMullen):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Dessaulniers (Maskin'g),	McMullen,
Amoyt,	Desjardins,	Mills,
Armstrong,	Dupont,	Mitchell,
Auger,	Fairbank,	Moock,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fisher,	Paterson (Brant),
Bechar,	Forbes,	Platt,
Bergeron,	Girault,	Ray,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Blake,	Glen,	Scrivner,
Bourassa,	Gony,	Somerville (Brant),
Burpee,	Gunn,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Huron),	Harley,	Springer,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Holton,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Innes,	Trow,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Irvine,	Vail,
Casey,	Jackson,	Watson,
Casgrain,	King,	Weldon,
Cook,	Kirt,	Wilson,
Coursol,	Landerkia,	Wright,
Davies,	McIntyre,	Yeo—60.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Poster,	Montplaisir,
Allison,	Gandet,	O'Brien,
Bain (Soulanges),	Gironard,	Orton,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Gordon,	Onimet,
Baker (Victoria),	Grandhols,	Pain,
Barker,	Guilbault,	Patterson (Essex),
Barnard,	Guillet,	Pinsonneault,
Beaty,	Hackett,	Pruyn,
Bell,	Haggart,	Reid,
Benoit,	Hall,	Riopol,
Blondeau,	Hay,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bourbeau,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bowell,	Hickey,	Royal,
Bryson,	Home,	Rykert,
Burnham,	Hutcheon,	Scott,
Burns,	Jameson,	Shakespeare,
Cameron (Inverness),	Jenkins,	Small,
Cameron (Victoria),	Kaulback,	Smylie,
Campbell (Victoria),	Kilvert,	Stairs,
Carling,	Kinney,	Taschereau,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Kranz,	Tass,
Cimmon,	Lahrosse,	Taylor,
Cochrane,	Landry (Kent),	Temple,
Costigan,	Landry (Montmagoy),	Thompson,
Coughlin,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Townshend,
Cuthbert,	Lesage,	Tupper,
Daly,	Macdonald (King's),	Tyrwhitt,
Daoust,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Vain,
Dawson,	Mackintosh,	Vannse,
Desaulniers (St. Maurice),	Macmaster,	Wallace (Albert),
Dickinson,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wallace (York),
Dodd,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Ward,
Dugas,	McCallum,	White (Cardwell),
Dundas,	McCarthy,	White (Hastings),
Everett,	McDougall (O. Breton),	White (Renfrew),
Farrow,	McGreavy,	Wigle,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	McLelan,	Wood (Brookville),
Ferguson (Welland),	McNeill,	Wood (Westm'ld)—118.
Fortin,	Masrue,	
	Moffat,	

Amendment negatived.

House then divided on amendment (Mr. Costigan):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Poster,	Masrue,
Bain (Soulanges),	Gandet,	Moffatt,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Gironard,	Montplaisir,
Baker (Victoria),	Gordon,	O'Brien,
Barker,	Grandhols,	Orton,
Barnard,	Guilbault,	Onimet,
Beaty,	Guillet,	Pain,
Bell,	Hackett,	Patterson (Essex),
Benoit,	Haggart,	Pinsonneault,

Blondeau,	Hall,	Prun,
Bonbréan,	Hay,	Reid,
Bowall,	Hosson,	Rioper,
Bryson,	Hickey,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Burnham,	Hillard,	Robertson (Hastings),
Burns,	Homer,	Royal,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hurteau,	Rykert,
Cameron (Victoria),	Jameson,	Scott,
Campbell (Victoria),	Jenkins,	Shakespeare,
Carling,	Kailbach,	Small,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Kilvert,	Spronle,
Cimon,	Kinney,	Stairs,
Cochrane,	Kranz,	Taschereau,
Cordigan,	Lahroese,	Tamé,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Taylor,
Cunran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Temple,
Cuthbert,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Thompson,
Daly,	Lesage,	Townshend,
Damst,	Macdonald (King's),	Tupper,
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tyrwhitt,
Desanliniers (St. Maurice),	MacIntosh,	Valin,
Dickinson,	Macmaster,	Vanasse,
Dodd,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wallace (Albert),
Dugas,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wallace (York),
Dundas,	McOallum,	White (Cardwell),
Evarts,	McCarthy,	White (Renfrew),
Farrow,	McDougall (O Breton),	Wigle,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	McGreery,	Wood (Brookville),
Ferguson (Welland),	McLellan,	Wood (Westm'd) —117.
Fortin,	McNeill,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Desjardins,	Mills,
Amoyt,	Dupont,	Mitchell,
Armstrong,	Fairbank,	Mulock,
Auger,	Fisher,	Pateron (Brant),
Bain (Wentworth),	Forbes,	Platt,
Bécharé,	Gigué,	Ray,
Bergeron,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Bernier,	Glen,	Scrivner,
Blake,	Guay,	Somerville (Brant),
Bourassa,	Gunn,	Somerville (Bruce),
Burpee,	Harley,	Springer,
Cameron (Huron),	Holton,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Innes,	Trow,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Irvine,	Yall,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Jackson,	Watson,
Casby,	King,	Weldon,
Casgrain,	Kirk,	White (Hastings),
Cook,	Landerkin,	Wilson,
Counsell,	McIntyre,	Wright,
Davies,	McMillen,	Yeo.—61.
Desanliniers (Mask'n'g'),		

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE. However deeply I may regret, Sir, that the Commons of Canada should have decided to speak with a voice so vague and ineffective, and to add so slight an impulse to the movement I was hoping to advance, it is yet for me to consider what is the best use that can be made of that vague and ineffective voice and that slight impulse. The resolution we are to substitute for the original resolution is a simple expression of our opinion, to lie upon our journals. Weak and inadequate as it is, it is still better that it should do some good; and I therefore move to add to the motion, as amended, the words following:—

And that a copy of the resolution be communicated forthwith by Mr. Speaker to Mr. Gladstone.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I object to this amendment simply on the plain ground that it is in direct contravention to the resolution we have just passed. It is in effect an address.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I object to it on another ground. I think it is unworthy of the dignity of this House that we should append to a resolution such as we have passed a message requiring you, as the Speaker of this House, to communicate it even to such a distinguished individual as Mr. Gladstone; and if by doing so, as I have no doubt my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition desires, we should give encouragement to his proposition for Home Rule for Ireland in the sense in which he has denounced

it, I demur to it on that ground also, as totally dissenting from any such proposition.

Mr. MITCHELL. I support it on this ground, that inasmuch as the minority of this House, who I believe will find their action endorsed by a majority in the country, have failed to get such a resolution as would fairly express in the strongest terms our approval of Home Rule for Ireland, and secure the greatest amount of good, I believe our next duty is to put the resolution adopted by this House into such a shape that the man who stands foremost in the world to-day, and is endeavoring to give Ireland the benefit of self-government, shall have his hands strengthened in every way in which we can do it; and I have much pleasure in seconding the resolution.

Mr. MILLS. The position the hon. First Minister has taken on this resolution shows very clearly to the House and the country what are his real feelings on this subject. It is well known that hon. gentlemen opposite are not sincere advocates of the principle of Home Rule. It is well known that the hon. leader of the Government has again and again declared himself against the principle of federation, against the principle of local self-government, and in favor of a legislative union. But those hon. gentlemen have not the courage of their convictions. While they profess to favor Home Rule, they propose a resolution that is addressed to nobody. Now, Sir, when my hon. friend proposes that that resolution should be sent to the Prime Minister of England, who is struggling with the aristocratic classes there to maintain the rights of the people of Ireland, then these hon. gentlemen say: We shall not consent that that resolution shall be sent to Mr. Gladstone; we shall not consent that it shall be put into the hands of the man who is seeking to confer that benefit on the people of Ireland; but we will leave it on the journals of our House; if the Irish people of Canada attack us we will say, we voted in favor of this resolution; and if our Orange friends are disposed to attack us for voting for Home Rule, we will say, it is true, we attempted to conciliate a section of our followers by voting for that resolution, but we refused to forward it to Mr. Gladstone, because we did not intend that it should be of the slightest service to the people of Ireland.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I crave the attention of this House for a few moments. I beg to propose a resolution, and I ask the followers of Sir John A. Macdonald to back me up:

That a copy of this resolution be sent to Mr. Parnell.

The Irish people to-day owe this movement to Mr. Parnell. We would not be here to-night voting for this resolution if it had not been for the noble exertions of that noble man. If any credit is due to any person for the position of the question to-day, it is due to Mr. Parnell; and I ask my hon. friends on this side of the House to back me on this resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is moved by Mr. Coughlin to strike out the word "Gladstone" and insert the word "Parnell."

Mr. BLAKE. I should have been very glad if the hon. gentleman had proposed to add the words "and Mr. Parnell" to the words of the resolution; and I should have cordially acceded to that, recognising as I do the great services that Mr. Parnell has rendered to the cause of Home Rule. But at this moment I think it is the hands of Mr. Gladstone that want strengthening, and I am not going to vote to strike out the name of Mr. Gladstone in order to substitute that of Mr. Parnell.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it is well that the First Minister, at any rate, has thrown off the mask, and has shown us clearly and distinctly, what all of us who know him know, that he has no sympathy for Ireland, and no more sympathy for Home Rule in Ireland than he has

for Home Rule in Canada. The hon. gentleman has been plotting, since the time he was sworn in as First Minister of Canada, against the Local Governments of this country. We know, Sir, that but for Sir George Cartier, when he was sent to England as a delegate some nineteen years ago, he would have misused and abused the power put into his hands to deprive us of our local liberties, and Sir, now, thrown off his guard for a moment, he cannot help showing his real sentiments. He cannot help showing as far as lies in him that even this emasculated and miserable resolution, which the Minister of Inland Revenue, I regret to say, has allowed himself to be made a tool of to have placed on our journals —

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman should not use that word.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, Sir, if you rule that to say that one Minister is the tool of another is out of order, I will withdraw that in deference to your ruling. I maintain my own opinion as to the use that has been made of the hon. gentleman by the First Minister on this particular occasion, as before: Sir, the hon. gentleman's resolution, I do not doubt in the least from the verbiage of it, has been conceived in the brain, if not traced by the hand of the First Minister; and Sir, if there could be a more contemptible, a more ridiculous, a more absurd proposition placed before this House, after formally passing a resolution—which if it has any meaning or object, if there is any conceivable sense in it, must be intended for the purpose of strengthening Mr. Gladstone in the struggle against great odds that he is now maintaining, for the bestowal of Home Rule upon Ireland—it is the refusal to adopt the sensible and intelligent proposition of my hon. friend beside me, that that resolution should be sent to Mr. Gladstone. What position shall we be in—what attitude shall we assume—if it turns out that we are bold enough to pass a resolution here, but are not bold enough to send it where alone it would be of use—that we have dared to put it on our journals, but do not dare to communicate it to the Imperial House? For my own part, I say that we, as British subjects, have got a good right to advise the Empire on all points of Imperial policy such as this. There are greater issues contained in this question than the mere question of Home Rule for Ireland. From this will spring other results. I believe that one result which will spring from this will be that in substance, within a few years, the English people will have to adopt a system somewhat similar to that which we have here; because I believe that this doctrine of Home Rule cannot be applied to Ireland alone, that, in all human probability, is comprised in it a Federate Parliament for the British Isles, and probably for the British Empire. It may be something more than that; it may be an alliance, if not a federation, of the whole British race, and it is because I believe it is the interest of the whole British Empire and British race depends to a large extent of doing away with these just causes of complaint which the Irish people have long had, that I am prepared to support my hon. friend's motion. But in any case, let us not commit the miserable absurdity of putting a resolution on our journals and yet not daring to communicate it to the Imperial Government.

Mr. McNEILL. There is no question of daring in the matter.

Mr. BURNS. No doubt, in a very few minutes, the action this House has taken will be cabled across the Atlantic, and not only Mr. Gladstone but everybody else in the British Islands will be aware of the action we have taken. I am in sympathy with the amendment of the hon. member for Middlesex, and I will support it. My reason is that the position of affairs to-day, as regards Ireland, is due

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

to the action of Mr. Parnell as much as to the action of Mr. Gladstone. Year after year the Irish people, under various leaders, struggled to obtain something like independence, and of late years Mr. Parnell has led them to what may be called victory. In 1882, when this Parliament passed resolutions and sent them to Mr. Gladstone, we know what action Mr. Gladstone and his Government took. At that time, he and his associates with him were not disposed to listen to the advice offered them by Canada, but now, when Mr. Gladstone is brought face to face with the difficulty, when he finds that Ireland has returned an almost unanimous representation on the principle of Home Rule, he, in order to strengthen his hands, seeks the advice and sympathy of those whose sympathy and advice he repelled in times gone-by. To Mr. Parnell is due more than to Mr. Gladstone the present position of affairs, and therefore I will vote for the amendment.

Mr. CURRAN. I have great pleasure in supporting the amendment of my hon. friend from Middlesex. I hear, on the other side of the House, a great many jeering remarks, but I want to say that, for my part, I look upon the sturdy perseverance with which Mr. Parnell has conducted his campaign, as being the cause of bringing Mr. Gladstone to the position he occupies, and if we are to give cheers, let us cheer the people who have done the fighting.

Mr. MITCHELL. I feel it is necessary to state the reason why I am going to support the amendment. I will support it, not because I think it is the best thing to be done in order to secure what the statesmen of England and Ireland are trying to secure for Ireland, but because it is the only thing open for us to do, after we have passed the resolution. This amendment is not in accordance with the dignity of the House, after having given expression to the opinions we have expressed, as to what the feelings and sentiments of this Parliament are upon the great question which is agitating our friends on the other side, but as this House, under the leadership of the right hon. gentleman, has chosen to refuse to send the resolution to Mr. Gladstone and to refuse to send the address to Her Majesty, as, while endorsing the sentiment he refuses to countenance its transmission, the proposition to send the resolution of the House to Mr. Parnell will receive my support. I have great satisfaction in endorsing what has been said about Mr. Parnell. He deserves every credit from his co-nationalists. By his perseverance, resolution and determination, he has done more than ordinary men could do, and I am pleased to be able to speak of him as I have, but to send the resolution to him alone, and not to Mr. Gladstone, is not in accordance with what I believe to be the true dignity of Parliament and the position of Canada.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have always objected to giving too much prominence to this question as a political question, either on this or the other side of the Atlantic. Hon. gentlemen have attacked and ridiculed me for pressing to send a cablegram to Mr. Parnell, and questioned my right to do so; they have questioned the importance of such a message coming from me on behalf of the Irish representatives of this House. I say this, that I objected to the address for the reasons I gave. I still hold that the Irish people at home and here are in doubt as to whether Mr. Parnell will approve of the measure before Parliament, as we may learn, in 10 or 15 days, that the measure proposed by Mr. Gladstone will be pronounced unsuitable for the Irish people by the men who have been fighting the battle from the first. In that case what position would we be in? I do not presume to go in advance of Mr. Parnell, but I am willing this House should convey, in the speediest manner possible, to Mr. Gladstone, to the leader of the Opposition, and to Mr. Parnell the hero of the struggle, the message stating what has taken place.

Mr. McNEILL. I cannot support the amendment to send this resolution, the expression of this House in favor of some measure of Home Rule, to the gentleman who said that he never would have taken off his coat to go to this work had he not expected by so doing to sever the last link between Ireland and England. So far as the other proposition is concerned, since Mr. Gladstone has told us in the most explicit manner to mind our own business, I will not support the proposal now made to send a resolution of sympathy to him when he feels himself in some difficulty.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). By the action of the House to-night—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I have kept very quiet and have interfered with no one, and I am only going to speak for a few moments. It looks, by the action of the House to-night, as if the people of Canada were unanimously in favor of Home Rule. I say it is not so. I say there are a large number of people in Canada who are not in favor of Home Rule. A large number of the Irish people are not favorable to Home Rule. Many gentlemen have said to-night that they come from Ireland; well, I think I know a little about Ireland, and I contend that the people of Ireland, as they are governed to-day, will be more contented than they will after they get Home Rule, if they do get it. I am opposed to this House interfering directly or indirectly with the British people. Let them pass their own laws without any interference from us. I am opposed to every motion made, and shall vote against every motion made, no matter from which side of the House it comes.

Mr. CASEY. I think the remarks of the leader of the House on this proposition were particularly unfortunate. They will be regarded by everybody in this country as indicating that the hon. gentleman preferred to risk the utility of the resolution which we are about to pass, to risk its having no effect at all rather than to appear to add anything to the strength of a party leader who is opposed to him in politics. Everyone will believe, Irish people and those of all other nationalities, that the hon. gentleman's opposition to the amendment is dictated by a petty jealousy of the party leader in England. The motion of the hon. member for North Middlesex (Mr. Coughlin) is objectionable for the reason stated by my hon. friend the leader. If you are going to send it to anybody, you must send it to the person who has control of the Government. You must send it to headquarters. If you do not send it to the Queen direct, you must send it to the leader of the Government. I should be very happy to see it sent to Mr. Parnell also, as suggested by my leader. I agree with the eulogies which have been passed upon Mr. Parnell, as a statesman and as a manager of his party. I am willing that he should have the compliment paid him, and should be willing, as my leader said, to have his name added; and I should not have any great objection to the suggestion of the Minister of Inland Revenue that it should be sent to all three representatives of parties in the English House of Commons.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CASEY. Excuse me, I lead nobody and these are my personal opinions. I have no objection to its being sent to the leader of the Opposition as well as to the other two, but I wish to urge upon the hon. member for North Middlesex to consider the position in which he is placing his friends and the friends of Home Rule by proposing to strike out the name of Mr. Gladstone. Surely, if Mr. Parnell deserves to have it sent to him, and it can only be a compliment in his case, because he is not the leader of a Government or even a member of a Government. The leader of the Government of England, who is sacrificing so much and risking so much to carry out the views of Mr. Parnell, deserves to have it sent to him also. Surely my hon. friend

does not wish to do this of his own desire. Surely it must have been put in his hands by somebody.

Mr. COUGHLIN. No, it was not.

Mr. CASEY. I accept the hon. gentleman's denial. Surely then he will accept the suggestion of his friend and leader the Minister of Inland Revenue, and will accept at all events his proposition or something else rather than the bald proposal to strike out the name of Gladstone and put in the name of Parnell. He will see, when he thinks it over, that he is putting himself and his friends and the cause of Home Rule in a very peculiar position.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not intend to notice the speech of the hon. gentleman from South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), or his remarks respecting myself. I have heard a good deal from him before, and have treated it in the same way as I do now, with contemptuous silence. The reason why I shortly objected to sending the resolution to Mr. Gladstone was that the whole of these resolutions, not only the resolution which was carried, but the original resolution moved by the hon. gentleman opposite, the amendment of my hon. friend, and the amendment to the amendment, will be sent by cable to England and known everywhere in England, by Mr. Gladstone, by Mr. Parnell, and by the leaders of the Opposition in both Houses, to-morrow. Therefore it would avoid the appearance of in fact sending an address to Mr. Gladstone instead of to Her Majesty. The information will go to England, it will have its effect in England completely and fully, and it will not have its full effect unless all the resolutions voted this evening should be sent at the same time. I have no objection that a resolution should be adopted and added that this resolution and the other resolutions on the same question voted upon shall be transmitted to the three gentlemen mentioned by my hon. friend.

Mr. BLAKE. That is not in order.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not just now.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of Mr. Coughlin.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Lost.

Mr. BLAKE. Yeas and nays.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I will withdraw it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. You cannot withdraw it.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Coughlin):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Barnard,	Guilbault,	Massey,
Burns,	Hackett,	Mitchell,
Cameron (Inverness),	Harteau,	Montplaisir,
Coughlin,	Jenkins,	Patterson (Essex),
Curray,	Macdonald (King's),	Royal,
Fortin,	Macintosh,	Shakespeare,
Girouard,	McGreavy,	Tassé.—22.
Grandbois,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Ferguson (Welland),	O'Brien,
Allison,	Fisher,	Orton,
Armstrong,	Forbes,	Quimet,
Anger,	Foster,	Paint,
Bain (Wentworth),	Gignault,	Patterson (Brant),
Baker (Missisquoi),	Gilmour,	Platt,
Baker (Victoria),	Glen,	Pruyn,
Barker,	Gordon,	Ray,
Beaty,	Guay,	Rea,
Bochard,	Guillet,	Rinfret,
Bell,	Gunn,	Riopel,
Benoit,	Haggart,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bergeron,	Hall,	Robertson (Hastings),
Berlier,	Harley,	Rykert,
Blake,	Hay,	Scott,
Blondeau,	Hesson,	Scriver,

Bourassa,
Bourbeau,
Bryson,
Burnham,
Burpee,
Cameron (Huron),
Cameron (Middlesex),
Cameron (Victoria),
Campbell (Renfrew),
Campbell (Victoria),
Carrington,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Casey,
Cassara,
Cimons,
Cochrane,
Cook,
Costigan,
Cuthbert,
Daly,
Davies,
Dawson,
Dickinson,
Dodd,
Dundas,
Dupont,
Evelart,
Fairbank,
Farrow,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)

Hickey,
Hilliard,
Holton,
Homer,
Innes,
Irvin,
Jackson,
Jameson,
Kaibach,
Kilvert,
King,
Kirk,
Kraus,
Landerkin,
Landry (Kent),
Landry (Montmagoy),
Langwin (Sir Hector),
Macdonald (Sir John),
Macmaster,
Macmillan (Middlesex),
McMillan (Vaudreuil),
McCallum,
McCarthy,
McDougall (C. Breton),
McIntyre,
McLellan,
McKellen,
McNeill,
Mills,
Moffat,
Monlock,

Small,
Somerville (Brant),
Somerville (Brace),
Springer,
Spry,
Stairs,
Sutherland (Oxford),
Taschereau,
Taylor,
Temple,
Thompson,
Townsend,
Trow,
Tupper,
Tyrrwhitt,
Vailin,
Vanasse,
Wallace (Albert),
Wallace (York),
Ward,
Watson,
Weldon,
White (Cardwell),
White (Hastings),
White (Renfrew),
Wigle,
Wilson,
Wood (Brookville),
Wood (Wesmoreland),
Yeo.—142.

but it will bring discredit and disgrace upon the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. CURRAN. I have no desire that the expression of opinion by this House should remain, even by implication, a dead letter. We know very well that the proceedings of this House will be telegraphed immediately to England, and if communicating it to the Speaker would be the best means of making it known, I would be in favor of doing so. In accordance with the expressed desire of all the organs who have spoken on the subject of Home Rule, if the leader of the Opposition had brought a direct motion in favor of Mr. Gladstone's position in the first instance, I should have supported it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I wish there may be no misunderstanding about this. I stated, before the hon. gentleman moved to add some words to the resolution, that I was willing that we should take such steps as would secure the intelligence of the action of this House being placed before the persons most interested. The hon. gentleman moved that it be sent to Mr. Gladstone, and my hon. friend from Middlesex (Mr. Coughlin) was anxious that Mr. Parnell should also be communicated with. I stated then that I thought we might solve the difficulty by communicating it to the three leaders in the House of Commons, so that there may not be any party significance given to it, and I state now that if the channel which the right hon. gentleman has indicated, that is the Speaker of the House of Commons, is one that will, without doubt, answer the purpose, I am willing to accept it. But you, Mr. Speaker, indicate that there is a doubt, and that it might not reach the House of Commons through the Speaker. I do not want any doubt about it.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No, the hon. gentleman need not say "hear, hear." The House of Commons having pronounced upon this question, there ought to be no bickering about the final steps to be taken now. I am willing to adopt any reasonable mode by which we can place this resolution before the people and Parliament of Great Britain, so that Mr. Gladstone shall have an opportunity of knowing what we have done, and that the leader of the English Opposition may also know, as well as Mr. Parnell. Mr. Speaker has questioned the competence of the House of Commons in England to communicate any message except through this House.

Mr. BLAKE. Then you had better persuade your leader to withdraw the motion.

Mr. THOMPSON. It seems to me the uneasiness manifested as to this resolution being known by those interested in this question is altogether misplaced. The House knows from the passage I read in the English *Hansard* this evening that on 1st May, 1892, before any official communication had reached Mr. Gladstone or the Colonial Office in London the proceedings of this House had not only appeared in the London *Times* but had been read in Mr. Gladstone's presence in the House of Commons. I undertake to say that before the news can be officially communicated by the officers of this House the proceedings of this afternoon will not only be published in London, but will be known to every member of the House of Commons, and therefore, the question of how we shall officially communicate is not one of essential importance as regards the contents of the resolution, but one in regard to which we may fairly consult our dignity by having the Speaker of this House communicate with the Speaker of the British House of Commons.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman like other hon. gentlemen opposite this evening has declared that we do not want to communicate this resolution to anyone.

Amendment negatived.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I mentioned a little while ago that I would propose certain amendments, but it has been suggested to me, in order to avoid the appearance of partisanship, that I had better substitute the following motion; I therefore beg leave to move:

That all the words after the word "following" be struck out, and the following be inserted: "And that a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the Speaker to the Speaker of the House of Commons in England."

Mr. BLAKE. This is another way of making the House speak with a dumb voice. This question arose with reference to the proper form of action in another assembly, an enquiry was made, and the result of the enquiry was that the Speaker of the House of Commons, in England, was deemed to have no authority to communicate to the House resolutions so transmitted to him. You, Sir, in the Chair, I think, will confirm that statement, so that if my motion is amended, as the hon. gentleman proposes, he will have accomplished his object. His object is to get rid of any communication across the water. He so stated. He said: We don't want to communicate. He then suggested that we should communicate to the Marquis of Salisbury the defeated motion, after he had found difficulty in the first place. Now he proposes we should communicate it to the person who will have no authority to communicate it to the House of Commons of England at all. It is an ingenious device to accomplish the objects of nullifying, as far as possible, the feeble effects of the resolution. I hope the House will not adopt that device, and I ask you to say whether I am not correct in that statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Speaker has no power or authority to communicate it to the House. A communication like this was sent to me from the British Columbia Legislature, and I simply sent it to the Prime Minister as a private communication.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no doubt that the Speaker of the House of Commons in England will take the same course you did. He will take steps to give it full publicity in England.

Mr. BLAKE. Why should he not send it to Mr. Gladstone directly.

Mr. MITCHELL. It looks very much like an attempt to burk the expression of opinion in this House. It is not only likely to result in the failure of the object of this discussion

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentlemen and also the First Minister have declared that on account of the despatch of Earl Kimberley it would be beneath the dignity of this House to communicate with Her Majesty. The hon. gentleman is afraid of sacrificing the dignity of Parliament by communicating anything to the Queen, and so when it was proposed to communicate the resolution to the Prime Minister of England, the Prime Minister of this country said we will not communicate the resolution to the Prime Minister, and he proposes to communicate it, to whom? To the Speaker, who cannot make known the communication officially to anyone. Hon. gentlemen object to communicate with the Prime Minister because it is beneath the dignity of this House to communicate with him. That is the only reason given. While hon. gentlemen opposite refuse to have a communication sent direct to the Prime Minister they wish to save our dignity by having the Speaker of the British House of Commons, after receiving the communication, communicate it to the Prime Minister, if he chooses. Of course, the hon. gentleman is proceeding on the assumption that he will choose to do so. That is the way the hon. gentleman proposes to get out of the difficulty, and I am sure the hon. gentleman's followers must be very highly pleased indeed with the demonstration made on this question this evening.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). It seems to me that this matter is really becoming a burlesque. Perhaps some hon. gentlemen wish to make it such, but I desire if possible to bring the House back to a sense of its own dignity. It seems to me it is entirely inconsistent with the dignity of this House that it should condescend to send any resolution it may pass to any individual or in any other way than by the usual and constitutional usage. It is entirely inconsistent with the dignity of the House that we should pass a resolution and add a rider that it should be sent to Tom, Dick or Harry.

Mr. BLAKE. His name is William Ewart.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Whether it is to Mr. Gladstone or Mr. Parnell or anybody else, so far as this Parliament are concerned they are Tom, Dick and Harry. We are degrading ourselves and losing sight of our dignity by sending the resolution to anyone or communicating anything except in a proper and constitutional manner. I trust any resolution communicating what we have done to-day will not be sent to anyone.

Mr. BLAKE. Let us expunge the resolution then.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). For all practical purposes I think the resolution might be expunged. In other words, the whole thing is buncomb. I think the leader of the Opposition in moving the resolution moved it as a buncomb resolution for the purpose of catching or strengthening his hold on the Irish Catholic people of Ontario, and the whole discussion from beginning to end has been conducted with that view, possibly by both sides of the House. I have no hesitation in saying so. It is all buncomb.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think it is an order for an hon. member to refer to a resolution of the House in that way.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I did not understand the resolution was yet passed.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the hon. gentleman voted for it.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). If it is unparliamentary to declare that what the House has done is buncomb, I withdraw the expression. I have no desire to offend against the rules of the House even by telling what every hon. member knows is the solemn truth. We know the dis-

cussion is conducted with this point in view, and that the leader of the Opposition who has expressed strong sympathy with his fellow Irishmen on moving this motion had an ulterior object in view.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I have not finished my sentence. I was going on to say that the hon. gentleman had an ulterior object in view of increasing that popularity in which the Irishmen of the country esteem him. I think that is parliamentary. I have no hesitation in saying that I believe the principal reason why my friend brought forward this motion and raised the discussion to-night has been a desire and expectation that the Irish Catholic vote will be influenced by this discussion.

Mr. MITCHELL. You said that before.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The hon. gentleman says I said that before. I think the hon. gentleman's observation and his votes too have been very largely influenced by the fact that there is a large Irish element in his constituency.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). To come back in all seriousness as to the right or propriety to transmitting the proceedings of this House to any other than a duly constituted assembly, or to Her Majesty, and that we should condescend to send them to individuals, even if they happened to be the leader of the British Government, or the leader of the Irish party.

Mr. MITCHELL. Half a loaf is better than no bread.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The public effect of the announcement, if it is deserving of any, will be given for what it is worth, and I think it is better to let the matter rest there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman should withdraw his motion.

Amendment to the amendment, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

Mr. MILLS. I beg leave to move in amendment to the amendment to add the name of Charles Stuart Parnell, M.P.

Mr. THOMPSON. I would suggest, inasmuch as hon. gentlemen opposite have not been willing to accede to the proposition of the Minister of Inland Revenue that the resolution should be communicated to the leaders of the various parties in the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh! Oh!

Mr. THOMPSON. I say that hon. gentlemen have manifested an unwillingness to do that, and there is no use in hon. gentlemen signifying their dissent. I will suggest as a motion, I will move in the event of this not being carried, that the resolutions be communicated to the Colonial Secretary.

Mr. BLAKE. After that statement, and the reason for it, I will state why I could not give my assent to this resolution being sent by the Parliament of Canada to the Marquis of Salisbury. The reason is that the Marquis of Salisbury is himself a bitter opponent of Home Rule in Parliament.

Mr. THOMPSON. He is leader of the Opposition.

Mr. BLAKE. Not in the House of Commons, and I suppose the leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons entertains the view of the leader of the Opposition in the House of Lords. On the 15th of April the Marquis of Salisbury expressed his views on this question, and he said:

"Home Rule, which a year ago was a chimera, has suddenly become a burning question. It needs no apology from us if, in presence of so great a calamity threatening our nation, we put aside all minor differences and join hands to defend that which is equally precious to us all."

A little later he said :

"Now this is, I hope, the commencement of a great many meetings which will take place in various parts of England. I hope, in the first instance, that these meetings will rouse up the people to study and appreciate the terrible gravity of the problem placed before them, and to resist this tremendous change in the constitution of their country. But I hope that such meetings will rouse them to do something."

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAKE. That is the view of the hon. member for Hastings.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. And that is the reason he would like to have the resolution sent to the Marquis of Salisbury and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach. The Marquis of Salisbury said further:

"My belief is that the future Government of Ireland does not involve any such unmanageable difficulty for the people of this country will be true to the Empire to which they belong (Loud cheers) We want a wise, firm, continuous administration of the law (Cheers). But you must support it, or it will not take place. We want a steady policy—there are no considerations of weariness or difficulty at Westminster, that no considerations attaching to the manifold ties of party government under which we live, shall drive aside from its strong course the policy upon which the people of England have decided. It is not enough for them to decide it. They must watch over it when it is decided; they must, by their constant and steady support, by the overwhelming force of their will, sweep away this body of resistance which has hitherto, at Westminster, prevented anything like a steady, or constant, or wholesome policy for Ireland (cheers); for this matter, believe me, does not concern Ireland alone. There is a great responsibility upon you, and it will be a terrible thing if, through your weakness, the Irish people are abandoned to the anarchy under which assuredly they will fall. But there is something more which you, as owners of a vast Empire extending to the ends of the earth, must consider before you take this fatal step downwards to which your rulers are inviting you now. There has been a great contest between England and the discontented portions of the Irish people. It is a contest that has lasted through many generations past, through many vicissitudes, and now you are asked to submit to a measure which is placed before you, and to end the contest by a complete and ignominious surrender."

Again he said :

"Your course is watched all over the world; if you consent to this great capitulation; if you mark it with these last signs of disgrace, that you abandoned those whom you induced to fight for you; if like the Russian traveller, you lighten your sledges for your own flight by throwing out your defenders to the wolves, believe me that it will not be a mere sentimental punishment that you will suffer. Your enemies in every part of the world will be looking on what you do with exultation. Your friends, your supporters, your partisans will view it with shame, with confusion and with dismay, in every quarter of the globe."

And the Minister of Inland Revenue proposes that we should send the resolutions to the Marquis of Salisbury.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has given the very strongest possible reason why, from his standpoint, this resolution should be sent to the gentleman he mentioned. If in 1882 it was necessary to send the resolution to a Parliament which was hostile to Home Rule, in order to persuade those who are not so far forward then, as they are now, it is from the hon. gentleman's own standpoint doubly necessary to express the opinion of this Parliament to the very able and very influential gentleman who does not happen to be so far forward as the leader of the Opposition in his Home Rule principles.

Mr. THOMPSON. Least it should be supposed that I was proposing by what I said that I would move hereafter that the resolution should be sent to the three leaders, I wish to say that my statement was that if the amendment should not be adopted my motion will be to transmit the resolutions to the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Mr. COSTIGAN. On remark in reply to the hon. leader of the Opposition. With regard to the Marquis of Salisbury he says that because that gentleman has expressed strong opinions against Home Rule we should not communicate the resolution to him, as it would only strengthen the hands of those who are opposed to Home Rule. I say that we should send the motion to the leader of the Opposition because I

Mr. BLAKE.

think we should send it to enemies as well as to the friends of Home Rule. I voted against the motion to exclude Mr. Gladstone's name and substitute Mr. Parnell's alone, in the expectation of having an opportunity of having Mr. Parnell's name added to Mr. Gladstone's.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am opposed to sending any address to Mr. Parnell, and I shall vote against it no matter in what shape or form it may come up. I think I can give a very good reason for so doing by reading an extract from Mr. Gladstone's opinion about Mr. Parnell and his dealings with the Home Rule question given not long since. He said :

"Mr. Parnell has never uttered one word of disapproval or misgiving about the assassination literature of America, maintained by a knot of Irishmen who are not ashamed to point out how the ships of Her Majesty's navy ought to be blown into the air, and how gentlemen that they are pleased to select ought to be made the object of the knife of the assassin. You know that there have been some attempts of that kind made in this country. You have heard of the explosion of dynamite in Salford. Mr. Parnell said that occurrence appeared to him to bear the character of a practical joke."

I certainly shall not, sitting here in my place in this Parliament, vote to send a resolution to Mr. Parnell, who has thus been characterised, and I believe truly characterised, by Mr. Gladstone, for reasons now apparent to us all. I would also refuse to send it to Mr. Gladstone for this reason. I think our sending it to him would be, as the leader of the Opposition desired by his resolution, an approval of the measure submitted by Mr. Gladstone for the consideration of the Imperial Parliament. While I am in favor of a fair and reasonable scheme of Home Rule which will secure the rights of the minority as well as the majority of the people of Ireland, I am not in favor, and I do not believe the majority of the people of Canada are in favor, of handing the minority over to the majority, and bringing about a worse state of things than existed before. I do not believe Mr. Gladstone's Bill is one that will be accepted by the people of Ireland. I believe it is accepted merely as a step in the direction of separation by the people who are advocating separation. I have good proof of that. I will read an extract from T. P. O'Connor's letter to the *London Times*, in which he speaks in very distinct terms of the measure Mr. Gladstone has presented to Parliament. He says :

"To tax Ireland for Imperial purposes and give Ireland no voice in Imperial affairs—"

That is the proposition in Mr. Gladstone's measure.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is changed.

Mr. McCARTHY. Pardon me, it is not changed. The only change is the dropping of the Land Bill, but this has not been changed, and there will not be any change in so vital a principle of Mr. Gladstone's measure.—

"I would be taxation without representation in a very aggravated form, and would be calculated to make the Empire odious instead of dear to the Irish people."

That is the measure now submitted, and that is the measure which Mr. Parnell has accepted as an instalment; but I think we all know that it is accepted with the view of carrying out the scheme Mr. Parnell has pursued for years, and has never attempted to deny, that is, the separation of Ireland and the dismemberment of the Empire. For these reasons I am opposed to sending this resolution to Mr. Parnell, and I am also opposed to sending it to Mr. Gladstone. I am not willing to go further than the House has gone in approving of a measure of Home Rule which is fair to all classes.

Mr. CURRAN. I very much regret that the last speaker should have read the statement made by Mr. Gladstone about Mr. Parnell. I am equally sorry that the hon. leader of the Opposition should have given the effusion that he gave from another English statesman. I do not think any great good can be done by the reading of these

extracts from speeches. I think anyone who has read Irish history knows that there is scarcely a British statesman who has not said things which, after consideration, he will not sincerely regret. I have stated to-night that, just as Mr. Gladstone has changed his opinion from what it was when he put Mr. Parnell into prison, so I am satisfied that with the progress of ideas, and the change that will take place in the political atmosphere, we shall find the gentleman who made the speech alluded to by the hon. leader of the Opposition, changing his views and his policy. I believe, however, that we ought now really to try to get a solution of this question, as has been aptly said, to-night. It is not merely to the friends of Home Rule that we wish to communicate the views of the Parliament of Canada, but we wish to let every man whose opinion is worth influencing, know exactly what the state of opinion in the Dominion of Canada is. Therefore, I hope the hon. gentlemen will accept the suggestion to add this other name, and that this discussion will end by a unanimous vote on the subject.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Mills.

YEAS :
Messieurs

Allen,	Dodd,	McGreavy,
Amoyt,	Dupont,	McIntyre,
Armstrong,	Fairbairn,	McMullen,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fisher,	Masane,
Bechard,	Forbes,	Mills,
Bergeron,	Giguant,	Mitchell,
Blake,	Gilmour,	Moffat,
Bourassa,	Girouard,	Mulock,
Bourbeau,	Glen,	Paterson (Brant),
Burns,	Guay,	Paterson (Essex),
Burpee,	Gunbault,	Platt,
Cameron (Huron),	Gunn,	Ray,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Hackett,	Rinfret,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Harcley,	Royal,
Caswright (Sir Rich ^d),	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Cassey,	Hurteau,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casgrain,	Innes,	Springer,
Cook,	Irvine,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Coutage,	Jackman,	Trow,
Coughlin,	King,	Vail,
Curran,	Kirk,	Watson,
Daly,	Landerkin,	Weldon,
Davies,	Macdonald (King's),	Wilson.—69.

NAYS :
Messieurs

Allison,	Grandchoix,	Pruyn,
Auger,	Guillet,	Reid,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Haggart,	Riopel,
Baker (Victoria),	Hall,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Barker,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Barnard,	Hickey,	Rykert,
Bealy,	Hilliard,	Scott,
Bell,	Homier,	Shakespeare,
Benoit,	Jamieson,	Small,
Blondeau,	Jenkins,	Sproule,
Bowell,	Kaulbach,	Stairs,
Byron,	Kilvert,	Tasse,
Burnham,	Kinney,	Taylor,
Cameron (Inverness),	Kranz,	Temple,
Cameron (Victoria),	Landry (Kent),	Thompson,
Campbell (Victoria),	Landry (Montagny),	Townsend,
Carling,	Langvin (Sir Hector),	Tupper,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tyrrhitt,
Clison,	Mackintosh,	Vain,
Cochrane,	Macmaser,	Yanasse,
Cuthbert,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wallace (Albert),
Dawson,	McCarthy,	Wallace (York),
Dickinson,	McDougall (O. Berton),	Ward,
Dundas,	McLellan,	White (Oardwell),
Everett,	McNeill,	White (Hastings),
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	O'Brien,	White (Renfrew),
Ferguson (Welland),	Orton,	Wigle,
Foster,	Quimet,	Wood (Brockville),
Gordon,	Paul,	Wood (Westland).—87.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. THOMPSON. I made a suggestion a few moments ago as to a channel through which I thought this resolution might be communicated without any objection and without any loss of dignity. Since then it has been sug-

gested that it would be desirable to have a more immediate and public communication on the matter. I therefore beg to move in amendment to substitute these words:

That the resolution be transmitted forthwith by the Speaker to the High Commissioner for Canada.—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am very glad that my motion seems to meet with very good humored approval by hon. members on the other side of the House; but I am afraid if they will allow me to finish reading it, that they will not be so well pleased.

"—for the information of the members of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom."

Mr. COOK. For the information of the Minister of Justice I would inform him that the High Commissioner is the gentleman who has no confidence in the breed.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister of Justice says this is in order to obtain more immediate transmission of the resolution to the parties whom it concerns. Instead of sending it to the First Minister of Great Britain for the information of the House of Commons, he wishes to send it to the High Commissioner of Canada for the information of the British House of Commons. Sir Charles Tupper is a very great man, and in the estimation of the Minister of Justice he is a peculiarly great man. The Minister of Justice owes his position in the Cabinet and many other things to him, but to ask us to believe that Sir Charles Tupper has greater facilities for communicating this resolution to the House of Commons than has the First Minister of England is an absurdity. I believe the Minister of Justice claims to be Irish to some extent. By proposing this motion, he has only shown his capacity for committing a most stupendous Irish blunder.

Mr. ORTON. I wish to explain why I have, upon every occasion on which a vote has been taken in this House with reference to communicating with Mr. Gladstone, opposed the proposition. It is because I feel that as Canadians we ought to uphold the dignity of the country, and I feel it is wrong for the Parliament of Canada to communicate in any way with Mr. Gladstone, who replied to our communication sent him in 1882 by a direct insult. We had the right to appeal to the Throne of Great Britain, but in consequence of the advice of Mr. Gladstone, our appeal was received with a reproof. I have great pleasure in supporting the Minister of Justice, because it is a direct compliment to our representative in Great Britain, and an assertion of our own dignity.

Mr. BLAKE. The Minister of Justice in behalf of the Government, which, a little while ago, declared, through the mouth of the leader of the Government, that they were opposed to any communication whatever, is now so anxious there should be direct and immediate communication, that he proposes to facilitate the immediate communication which, at the beginning of the discussion, was thought objectionable, by a process which rather seems to be based on the belief in the old proverb that "the longest way round is the shortest way home." The most prompt way of communicating the resolution to the English House of Commons would be to communicate it to the leader of that House, but the hon. gentleman thinks he will get nearer and quicker to the House by communicating to Sir Charles Tupper who has not yet obtained a seat in that body, which some newspapers declared he was seeking. How then is he going to communicate it to the members of the House? By issuing circular letters, each containing a copy of the despatch, to the members, so that each member will find it in his box at the post office? Is that the way each individual member is to receive our communication from the High Commissioner? This is only another proof of the secret feelings of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If this is to be cabled to the High Commissioner, let it be made "collect."

House divided on motion of Mr. Thompson.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Atkinson,	Hackett,	Paint,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Haggart,	Prayn,
Barnard,	Hegson,	Reid,
Beary,	Hickey,	Riopel,
Benoit,	Homer,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Blondeau,	Hurteau,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bowall,	Jamieson,	Royal,
Bryson,	Kaulbach,	Scott,
Burnham,	Kilvert,	Shakespeare,
Cameron (Inverness),	Kinney,	Small,
Campbell (Victoria),	Kraus,	Sisler,
Carling,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tassé,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Taylor,
Cochrane,	Macdonald (King's),	Temple,
Costigan,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Thompson,
Cuthbert,	Mackintach,	Townshend,
Daly,	Macmaster,	Turner,
Dawson,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Tyrwhitt,
Dickinson,	McCarthy,	Yalin,
Dundas,	McDougall (O. Breton),	Vanasse,
Everett,	McLellan,	Wallace (Albert),
Ferguson (Welland),	McNeill,	Ward,
Fortin,	Moffat,	White (Oardwell),
Foster,	Montplaisir,	White (Renfrew),
Gordon,	O'Brien,	Wigle,
Grandbois,	Orton,	Wood (Brookville)—80.
Guillet,	Quimet,	

YEAS :

Messieurs

Allen,	Dodd,	McMillen,
Amoyt,	Dupont,	Mills,
Armstrong,	Fairbank,	Mitchell,
Auger,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	Mulock,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fisher,	Patterson (Brant),
Baker (Victoria),	Forbes,	Patterson (Essex),
Barker,	Gigault,	Platt,
Bechard,	Gilmor,	Ray,
Bell,	Girouard,	Rinfret,
Bergeron,	Glen,	Rykert,
Blake,	Guay,	Somerville (Brant),
Bourassa,	Guilbault,	Somerville (Bruce),
Burns,	Gunn,	Springer,
Burpee,	Harley,	Sproule,
Cameron (Huron),	Hilliard,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Holton,	Trow,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Innes,	Vail,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Irvine,	Wallace (York),
Casgrain,	Jackson,	Watson,
Cook,	Jenkins,	Weldon,
Coughlin,	King,	White (Hastings),
Curran,	Landerkin,	Wilson,
Daly,	McIntyre,	Wood (Westland)—70.
Davies,		

The House divided on the motion of Mr. Costigan, as amended:

YEAS :

Messieurs

Allen,	Fisher,	Moffat,
Allison,	Fortin,	Montplaisir,
Amoyt,	Foster,	Mulock,
Armstrong,	Gigault,	O'Brien,

Auger,	Gilmor,	Orton,
Bain (Wentworth),	Glen,	Paint,
Baker, Missisquoi),	Gordon,	Patterson (Brant),
Barker,	Grandbois,	Patterson (Essex),
Barnard,	Guay,	Platt,
Beary,	Guillet,	Prayn,
Bochard,	Gunn,	Ray,
Bell,	Hackett,	Raid,
Benoit,	Haggart,	Rinfret,
Bergeron,	Harley,	Riopel,
Blake,	Harrison (Hamilton),	Robertson (Hastings),
Blondeau,	Hickey,	Royal,
Bourassa,	Hilliard,	Scott,
Bowall,	Holton,	Shakespeare,
Bryson,	Homer,	Small,
Burnham,	Hurtan,	Somerville (Brant),
Burns,	Innes,	Somerville (Bruce),
Burpee,	Irvine,	Springer,
Cameron (Huron),	Jackson,	Sproule,
Cameron (Inverness),	Jamieson,	Stair,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Jenkins,	Tassé,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Kaulbach,	Taylor,
Carling,	Kilvert,	Temple,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	King,	Thompson,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Kinney,	Townshend,
Casgrain,	Kirk,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Kraus,	Turner,
Cochrane,	Landerkin,	Tyrwhitt,
Cook,	Landry (Kent),	Yalin,
Costigan,	Landry (Montmagny),	Vanasse,
Coughlin,	Langvin (Sir Hector),	Wallace (Albert),
Curran,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (York),
Cuthbert,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Ward,
Daly,	Mackintosh,	Watson,
Davies,	Macmaster,	Weldon,
Dawson,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	White (Oardwell),
Dickinson,	McCarthy,	White (Renfrew),
Dodd,	McDougall (Oap Biston),	Wigle,
Dundas,	McIntyre,	Wilson,
Dupont,	McLellan,	Wood (Brookville)—140
Everett,	McMillen,	
Fairbank,	McNeill,	
Ferguson (Welland),	Mills,	

YEAS :

Messieurs

Baker (Victoria),	Forbes,	Rykert,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	Mitchell,	White (Hastings)—8.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think it is well now that we should know what course is to be taken by the High Commissioner in London when he receives this document.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is nothing before the Chair.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is rather too late to discuss the subject now, but I think the Government ought to give the matter their serious attention, and direct the Commissioner how he will communicate it to the members of Parliament.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 4:30 a.m. (Friday.)

Printed by McLEAN, ROSS & Co., Parliamentary Printers, Wellington Street, Ottawa.